THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

VOLUME XVIII FEBRUARY, 1932 NUMBER 1

PROLEGOMENA TO ARGUMENTATION

EDWARD Z. ROWELL
University of California

PART I. THE PROBLEM, ITS NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE*

THE present era in the history of speech education is marked by a notable outburst of research in what may be called the science of speech and of the re-writing of the several disciplines which are embraced by the subject. It is a period in which the traditional theories and methods in the field are being re-examined and revised with the motive of aligning them organically with recent doctrines about man and the character of his varied behavior. The main inspiration of all this activity has had its basis in the revival of interest in human nature as an important element in the study of speech making.

In the special field of argumentation this research and this re-writing have been going on no less energetically than elsewhere. Teachers of the discipline have criticised the theories and methods set forth in the standard text-books and have insisted that we should and can find new and sounder bases upon which to build. Some have made studies of particular problems of theory or of practice. Some have tried to work out wholly new foundations for the discipline as a whole. And some have even produced new text-books with more or less novel treatments of the subject.

So much has now been said and done that the time appears to be

*This is the first of a series of four articles on the general topic presented above.

here when we should stand aside and ask ourselves critically just where the whole matter stands. What, exactly, is it that is supposed to be wrong with the standard treatment of argumentation? What is it that the writers with the new point of view wish to put in its place? In what respects are their ideas valid? And, how, in view of all our present knowledge, ought we to-day to treat the process of argumentation as a science and as a discipline? The following study is an attempt to deal systematically with the more fundamental of these questions and problems.

Main Characteristics of Our Standard Tradition in Argumentation

Traditionally, the teaching of argumentation in our colleges has followed essentially the system developed in his class room by Professor George P. Baker in his first years at Harvard. With this standard pattern we are all at least practically familiar. In order, however, that we may come into immediate grips with our material at the outset of our inquiry, it is desirable that we remind ourselves at this point of the main characteristics of this tradition.

First, the course in argumentation which is embodied in our standard texts represents the creation of a new discipline, rooted in the old rhetoric but shaped for modern class room use. It represents, in other words, not so much an empirical study of the nature of argumentation as a system for the directed training of the student in the making of argument.

Second, the material of the texts falls into four general divisions, each of which represents a phase in the preparation and delivery of the argumentative discourse. Specifically, these divisions deal with the subjects of analysis, briefing, evidence, and speech presentation.

Third, in what may be called underlying theory, the standard tradition embodies two important assumptions: first, that the basic nature of argumentation partakes essentially of the nature of logical reasoning, and second, that arguing represents the dual process of appealing to reason and of appealing to feeling. That is to say, the standard tradition teaches us to approach the making of argument as if it were primarily a logical task, and makes room for appeals to feeling as a more or less independent and, in some respects, secondary category.

Fourth, the standard tradition employs in its section on evidence

the logic mainly of Aristotle and that of John Stuart Mill. It employs for the most part, to use more familiar terms, the deductive and inductive processes of the older logical traditions.

And fifth, many of the texts have warped the course in order to cater primarily to the needs of the college debater.

The Attacks on the Standard Tradition

Now, against this standard tradition there have been levelled from time to time, particularly since the establishment of our *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, many serious attacks. Some of these have been made at the conventions of teachers of speech and have not found their way into print. Others have appeared as more or less systematic studies in the form of published articles. Others still have been embodied in the prefaces to the newer text-books. A summary view of the most important of these attacks is a necessary next step in the development of our inquiry.

The first important attack came from the pen of Miss Mary Yost of Vassar. This appeared in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* in April, 1917 as an article bearing the title "Argument from the Point of View of Sociology."[1] In this article Miss Yost objects primarily to the fact that all the standard texts approach the work of argumentation from the point of view of logic. This seems to her unsound, not only because this is an inadequate approach needing to be merged with social and psychological approaches, but also because it is theoretically fallacious. To quote her own words: "The generally accepted theory of argumentation as expressed in the text-books — explicitly in the definitions and their explanations, and implicitly in the arrangement of the books—is based on a psychology not in harmony with modern ideas of the way the mind works, and therefore the following of its rules leads to artificial writing and speaking. We can see this clearly if we examine how one of the most fundamental of the questions connected with the theory of argumentation, the way argument effects its end, is handled. Almost all of the text-books state that an argument effects its end by means of *conviction* and *persuasion*. With some variation in wording in the different books, the definitions of each term are practically the same: *conviction* is an

[1] Miss Mary Yost: Argument from the Point of View of Sociology. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. III, No. 2, pp. 109–124.

appeal to the reason, persuasion an *appeal to the emotions* . . . . Now this explanation of the terms *conviction* and *persuasion* was formulated when the belief held sway that the mind was divided into three compartments, the reason, the emotion, the will—roughly the assumptions of the old faculty psychology. Today, however, the leading psychologists have found these assumptions inadequate to explain the phenomena of the mind. A conception of the mind as an organic unit performing a particular function—reasoning, feeling, willing—as may be demanded by the situation the individual is meeting, has taken the place of the more rigid, formal idea. . . . The new point of view I chose from which to study argument was one suggested by sociology . . . . The study of argument from a standpoint other than the logical should lead to a fuller, more organic theory than is current now. . . . ."[2]

These quotations come from the introductory portion of Miss Yost's article. The body of the article sets forth how argument functions in human life when viewed from the point of view of the social situation in which it appears, and how this sociological observation of it dictates the modification of our argumentative theory and procedure. Basically, this modification calls for the shifting of the audience into the main focus of the arguer and so abandoning the assumption that arguing is primarily a logical task.

Summed up, Miss Yost's article makes the following points: (1) To regard argumentation as primarily a logical task is unsound. The logical element is just one of the factors in the situation. (2) To explain the process of argument in terms of the traditional duality of *conviction* and *persuasion* is unscientific when tested in terms of modern psychology, and unimportant when viewed in terms of the social approach to the task of arguing. (3) Argumentation according to our standard tradition has always exhibited an artificiality which can be avoided only through the adoption of a more organic basic theory. (4) Sound argumentation must begin with a view of the whole social situation in which the argument must appear, instead of beginning with the handling of the subject-matter. (5) What is known as analysis will thus have to include, besides the study of the topic, a study of the social situation itself. We shall have to have, in other words, not only a subject analysis, but also a social analysis.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 110–113.

(6) The position of the brief in the arguer's work will be changed. Instead of being an outline guide to the presented argument, it will become the preliminary test of the arguer's thinking.

Miss Yost's article aroused to immediate action the late Professor Charles H. Woolbert, who was at the time occupying himself with the study of psychology in its relation to the field of speech. Recognizing the value of Miss Yost's sociological study, he undertook to support and supplement it with studies of his own in which psychology became the fundamental science. As a result there emerged from his pen a group of thought provoking articles[3] in which he not only criticised the standard tradition, but also set forth a full outline of the principles and methods of the new psychologically conditioned argumentation as he conceived it.

In the first of these articles Woolbert developed the following claims: (1) The business of arguing is the business of influencing people's minds. The study of the action of people's minds is properly the province of psychology. It follows, therefore, that if we are to understand the principles and methods of argumentation, we must rely on psychology as the fundamental science in the field. Rhetoricians and lexicographers can do little here. (2) Any division of appeal and speech into *conviction* and *persuasion* is unsound from the point of view of psychology and unnecessary from the point of view of rhetorical theory. Psychology to-day stands for a monistic view of the human personality. It leaves no room for the division of our functions of reasoning, feeling, and willing into separate faculties. The rhetorical duality must, therefore, be artificial and arbitrary. (3) As a matter of fact, what has gone in the past under the names of *conviction* and *persuasion* is something quite different from what those terms have traditionally implied. This something is found in the two ways in which people react to speakers, namely, through perceivably active or overt response, and through response that remains inner or covert. Psychologically, these are at basis alike and justify no such dualism as the old rhetoric and the traditional argu-

[3] All of these appeared in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*. They are as follows: "Conviction and Persuasion: Some Consideration of Theory," vol. III, No. 3, pp. 249-264; "The Place of Logic in a System of Persuasion," vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 19-39; "Persuasion: Principles and Methods," Part I, vol. V, No. 1, pp. 12-25; Part II, vol. V, No. 2, pp. 101-119; Part III, vol. V, No. 3, pp. 212-238.

mentation have assumed. (4) The hearer, and not the subject matter, should be the basis of the important divisions which we must make in a course in argumentation. (5) The whole theory of argumentation needs to be re-written to fit the facts of mind as modern psychology views them—that is, in terms of the one concept of the stimulus-response situation. (6) When this re-writing is attempted, the result will be one which can most appropriately be subsumed under the general term "persuasion".

In the second of his papers Woolbert dealt with the question: If only one process is involved in the arguer's effect of influencing the hearer, what is to be done with logic: what can we say as to its place in a system of persuasion which rests on a monistic psychology of the function of the mind? To this question Woolbert gave the answer that logic pervades the whole process of the hearer's response to the speaker's address. This doctrine runs about as follows: The essence of the logical process is the making of inferences. These inferences are made on three general levels of consciousness, the subconscious level, the partly conscious level, and the conscious level. But on all three of these levels the process is ultimately identical in nature because it is reducible to a type of neuro-muscular action. Again, therefore, we reach the conclusion that a duality which keeps the logical set apart from the non-logical must be a false assumption, and that the demand for the re-writing of our discipline is thus newly emphasized. That this re-writing needs not to be regarded as an impossible task is evidenced by the fact that this three-level logic is shown to suggest rather readily its own formulae for the persuader.

In the remaining three articles, which constitute a series, Woolbert attempted a constructive statement of a system of principles and methods which he believed the new persuasion would have to follow. These papers we need not summarize or discuss at this time. Their turn will come more appropriately later.

Following the chronological order of the appearance of these attacks, we come next upon a pair of articles written by Mrs. Gladys Murphy Graham in 1924 and 1925 on the subject of logic in its relation to argument.[4]

Disregarding entirely what had been claimed and demanded by

[4]"Logic and Argumentation," vol. X, No. 4, pp. 350–363; "The Natural Procedure in Argument," vol. XI, No. 4, pp. 319–337, this *Journal*.

Miss Yost and Mr. Woolbert, and ignoring the question of the primacy of logic in argumentation, Mrs. Graham addressed herself to the question whether the sections in our text-books which dealt with logic did justice to that subject. Her answer to that question was that they did not. The main points of her paper were as follows: (1) At present logic has only a fragmentary and loose connection with argumentation as treated in our texts. The developments in the field of logic which have taken place in recent decades are completely ignored, and the traditional methods of deduction and induction which are discussed are only mechanically related to the process of argument. (2) There is a good deal in the new logical thought that is sound and valuable, but we cannot make use of it because of the forbidding nature of the brief which we all persist in using. The brief is in nature formal, built on the pattern of the categorical syllogism. It thus excludes, through its very mechanics, the non-syllogistic type of argument. (3) We can find in Bosanquet's studies of logical implication an outline of a natural process of argument which calls for our recognition but which we cannot employ without creating for it a suitable type of brief. Many teachers of argumentation have felt the difficulties which the old linear type of brief creates.

Since the appearance of these criticisms by Miss Yost, Mr. Woolbert, and Mrs. Graham, four text-books have been published which in one way or another reflect their influence. The first, and the most radically new of these, is the Harper book, Collins and Morris: "Persuasion and Debate".[5]

The "Preface" to this text reveals to us interesting items in the point of view of the authors. It tells us (1) that the purpose of the text is "to provide a thoroughly modern exposition of the basic logical and psychological principles and practical methods of oral and written persuasion"; (2) that there is a need for a "constructive exposition of the technique of oral and written persuasion conceived in the light of the new facts and new theories discovered and formulated by the rapidly expanding science of psychology"; (3) that the majority of the older texts erroneously took it for granted "that the task of influencing human conduct is entirely a logical task"; (4) that many of the more recent texts "have emphasized the technique of debate and its specialized strategies at the expense of an instruc-

[5] Published in 1927.

tive discussion of the broader and more important problem of persuasive composition"; (5) that the word "persuasion" appears in the title of the text because it is "a more inclusive word than 'argumentation' and that it is more descriptive of the process which they wish to discuss, the process of influencing the conduct (belief or action) of a particular audience."

The body of this book consists of three sections which bear the respective titles of "Analysis", "Synthesis", and "Debate". Throughout the book there is evidence that the course has been conceived in thorough sympathy with the thought of Woolbert.

The second of these texts is Baird's "Public Discussion and Debate".[6] Mr. Baird tells us in his "Preface" that (1) the book is an attempt to "restate familiar argumentative principles in terms of present-day speech, logic, and psychology"; that (2) "in recent years the pendulum in student public speaking has swung from interest in formal argument and, perhaps, contest debate to the study and practice of discussion in its broader application, including public discussion, committee conference, persuasive business talk, and open-forum debating", and that this text "opens for the student this wider field of controversy"; that (3) another aim of the book is "to apply to discussion and debate the elementary principles of logic", with a definite recognition of the known criticism that argumentation had not hitherto assimilated the contributions of the newer logicians to their field; and that (4) the text emphasizes "discussion and debate as a problem in psychology".

The body of this text reveals that the author did wish to recognize the trends expressed by the three critics but that he made use of their ideas much more conservatively than had Messrs. Collins and Morris. Mr. Baird simply rewrote the traditional argumentation in terms of the new trends, whereas Messrs. Collins and Morris went the length suggested by Woolbert.

The third of these texts is the new "Argumentation" by Winans and Utterback.[7] According to the "Preface" to the work, the book (1) "represents an attempt to write a thoroughly practical treatise on argumentation", (2) "is based on the conviction that while logic supplies us with most of the tools of argumentation, it is from psych-

[6] A. Craig Baird: *Public Discussion and Debate.* Ginn, 1928.

[7] Winans and Utterback: *Argumentation.* The Century Company, 1930.

ology that we must learn to use them", and (3) that it deliberately omits separate chapters on evidence, debate, and the principles of composition because much of the material of such chapters is not of enough importance to justify the space usually given to it, and because the useful portions of this material could be treated more conveniently in connection with other topics.

This preface implies an essential conservatism in the authors in regard to the traditional treatment of argumentation as primarily a logical task. The body of the text confirms the implication. The authors define argumentation as the "art of influencing thought and conduct by an appeal addressed primarily to the understanding". They ignore the concepts of *conviction* and *persuasion* and treat their material as if logic and psychology could go hand in hand without giving evidence that there is a tension between them. They also refrain from revealing to the student the existence of any controversy in the field among the ranks of the teachers of the subject.

The fourth and last of these texts is "The Method of Argument" by Professor Fritz.[8] According to the "Preface" to the work, the point of view from which the "Method" has been written is "the psychological rather than the logical one". This would indicate an essential sympathy with the reforms proposed by Miss Yost and Mr. Woolbert. The body of the text shows this influence in only a moderate degree.

The Questions Arising from these Attacks

Now, if we glance over these criticisms and claims and points of view, we can see that the questions they raise are not of equal theoretical importance. Thus, some of these questions are matters simply of good timely policy. This is certainly true of the proposition that our texts should be written for general use rather than for college debaters particularly. Others of these questions are very largely, if not wholly, matters of arbitrary choice. This is doubtless true of the question of terminology. Shall we use the term "persuasion" or the term "argumentation" as the major designation? Historically, either has been used to include the other. Again, some of these questions seem to depend for their solution on the previous solution of questions which are more basic in the situation as a whole. To this

[8] Fritz: *The Method of Argument.* Prentice-Hall, 1931.

class very probably belongs the question of the brief. But some of these questions have the nature of problems of fundamental theory in which we are in search, not of desirable expediencies or of defensible preferences, but of what corresponds to or at least approaches scientific truth. It is these, primarily, that shall claim our attention.

But, what are these fundamental questions which are yet to be solved? Miss Yost tells us that we should approach argument from the social point of view. Do we question the soundness of that doctrine? Not at this date. We all readily agree that the social approach to argument should somehow be incorporated into our principles and methods of argumentation. Not all of us, however, are ready to say that the social point of view should so absorb us as to render invalid the whole traditional distinction between *conviction* and *persuasion*. Mr. Woolbert tells us that the business of arguing is the business of influencing people's minds. With a view to empirical facts, that statement ought to be qualified somewhat, but in general we may say that we agree with him. But when he carries the matter farther, many of us must reject his leadership. Thus, when he says that (1) it follows that if we are to understand the principles and methods of argumentation, we must rely on psychology as the fundamental science in the field, that (2) in view of the psychological monism of today our traditional distinction between *conviction* and *persuasion* must be pronounced invalid, and that (3) if this is so, our logical approach to argumentation must be radically unsound and the need of the day is to re-write the whole theory of argumentation,—when he develops these points,—we are inclined to disagree with him. Mrs. Graham tells us that when we examine our text-books in the light of the whole development of logical theory to date, we can see that we have in our argumentation courses only a fragment of the available logic and that that fragment is only loosely connected with the processes of argument. This is obvious to anyone who knows both logic and argumentation as we teach it. But beyond this point we are at sea. To be sure, Mrs. Graham shows us how available and how valuable would prove the adoption of Bosanquet's treatment of the "natural procedure" in argument, but she herself recognizes that Bosanquet's contribution is not the only new thing in logic since Mill, and is fully aware that it will be a difficult

matter to incorporate all the new contributions organically in the principles and processes of argument.

It appears, then, that we are confronted with the following general fundamental questions: First, exactly what changes ought we to make in our fundamental theory in argumentation, in view of our knowledge of man as revealed especially in modern psychology, social psychology, and sociology? Second, if the changes demanded lead at all far away from our known tradition, how are we to conceive and create the new set of principles and methods? And third, what are the new developments in the field of logic which demand our recognition, and how can we incorporate them organically in our argumentation?

The Significance of this Problemizing

But why should we worry over these matters, after all? Is it not perceptible to every thoughtful teacher of our subject that no thoroughly sound and complete text-book in argumentation can ever be written? And is it not true that if we possess the genius for speech and argument, we will succeed regardless of theory?

Perhaps so. And the most pertinent way in which we can reply to these questions is with the declaration that we have nothing to lose and everything to gain, if our research can lead us at last to undoubted truth. If possible, human beings should be in possession of sound intellectual bases for all their activities and enterprises. We would not doubt the rightness of this doctrine in relation to the work of the physician; why should we doubt its rightness in relation to the arguer and the teacher of argumentation? But this thought is altogether elementary and obvious and we need not pursue it further.

A thought which we ought to consider in this connection, and that with some seriousness, is, according to the belief of this writer, that the fundamental problems of argumentation have profound social significance. Miss Yost sensed this to a degree and in a way when she expressed the belief that the social point of view might establish an ethical basis for speech. But the present writer has in mind quite another consideration, and that is the possible relation of our theoretical problems to the problem of social control.

What do we mean by social control? We mean by it the regulation of our behavior in groups. We mean by it the influencing of human conduct along socially constructive channels. We mean by

it every effort aimed at the promotion of all human values. We mean by it the use of such agencies as customs and conventions, laws, government, education, art, belief, public opinion, and science in the interest of the group as a whole.

This problem is with us all the time, but there are moments when it becomes critically intense. One of these moments, the author believes, we are living through now, and have been living through, for that matter, since the War. How shall we turn the world toward socially constructive action? How shall we save ourselves from another war? How shall we conduct ourselves with regard to such movements as Fascism and Bolshevism? What shall we think at present of our own capitalistic society? And once we decide these questions, how shall we make our group follow the decision? These are a few of the many questions which confront us today.

Now, it is quite obvious that in order to exert conscious control over society we need to know something about the human nature which we wish to direct. We need to understand, that is, the secret of human responsiveness to the directing influence. And this raises the question, what and where is the agency with which we can secure the responses we desire?

Traditionally it has been said that there are two such agencies, the appeal to reason and the appeal to feeling. And it has been assumed that somehow reason was superior to feeling, that men were supposed to govern themselves by rational judgment, and that when they governed others, they were to do it in a way which appealed to the judgment of their followers. As for the feelings, they were supposed to come into operation either as merely accessory to the reason or as its substitute when reason failed in its task. But then along came voluntaristic psychology, behaviorism, social psychology, psychoanalysis and differential psychology. Along came also the theories and techniques of advertising and salesmanship. And, climaxing it all, along came the terrible disillusionment which has succeeded the War. Does anyone still believe that reason is the primary force which governs men? Hardly anyone. It is feeling that governs us most, we say. For the most part, reason's own characteristic reaction is rationalization. And so we are in an era of pessimism about the role of reason in society, a pessimism which turns even cynical on occasion.

And the thing that should make us pause is the fact that it is

under the influence of this pessimism that we are asked to re-write our rhetorical theory. Must we adopt this pessimism about the place of reason in human life and so give reason a definitely less preferred place in the new argumentation? Or is it possible that the traditional exaltation of reason has been on the better track?

If the new point of view is right, we may be giving a fuller recognition to a way of influencing human behavior which is more immediately effective than the way traditionally employed. But then, we must ask, is such an influence well-grounded in knowledge and truth? If it is not, how can it last? How can it hold? If the facts of human nature permit us still to believe in something corresponding to the appeal to reason, we have some hope of building upon truth. If, however, the facts of human nature bar us from that belief, we may have to content ourselves with building upon skill and power and strategy. And that would mean that others could at any time undo our work through greater skill and power and strategy. It would mean that the contest for social control would forever remain a kind of war. And it would undoubtedly mean that we have entered upon another era of sophism. Of is there, after all, a middle ground here where the values of both reason and feeling can remain inviolate?

This is just a hint of the serious social significance of our problem. Perhaps none of us teachers of argumentation have the ability to carry the solution of that problem very far. However that may be, we cannot but feel that it is as much our problem as it is the problem of philosophy and the social sciences, and that we have the greatest possible motivation for attempting to solve it in the painful confusion and distress of our contemporary society.

EXPERIMENTAL WORK IN AUDIENCE REACTION

WILLIAM A. D. MILLSON
Western Reserve University

EXPERIMENTAL work in the field of Speech stands in much the same position today as that occupied by Experimental Psychology when Fechner first published his *Elemente der Psychophysik*, some seventy-one years ago. Aside from literary and bibliographical research, and the fine experimental work now being carried on in

phonetics and speech correction, research in the field of Speech, and more particularly in the field of audience-speaker relationships, is almost nil. Our research in audience psychology has been largely confined to that arm-chair speculation which characterized empirical psychology preceding 1860.

Yet in its first report (published in the Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking for July, 1915), the first "Research Committee" of the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking, made a plea for "an observational study of audiences".[1] In April of the same year, the same committee appended the following to its report, under the heading of "Research Problems":

> "For those whose preparation has included a thorough training in the technique of research work, the following more specific problems are suggested:
>
> 1. To determine the effects in the audience of having the speaker stand at different distances from his audience and to determine the best distance.
>
> 2. To determine the size (real or partly real and partly imaginary) of the audience which makes the utterance most effective.
>
> 3. To determine the effects in the audience of using one's usual voice and of using an assumed voice.
>
> 4. To determine the effects on the audience of increasing or decreasing:
>
> a. The number of Latin words.
> b. The amount of predication.
> c. The number of figures of speech.
> d. The number of certain kinds of words such as abstract or concrete terms.
> e. The length of sentences.
> f. The use of analogies.
>
> 5. To determine the effects in the audience of the speaker's using different kinds of images, ideas, thoughts, and purposes.
>
> 6. To determine the effects in the audience of directness, repetition, emphasis, clearness, etc.

[1] Research Committee: *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, Vol. 1, July 1915, page 196.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, April, 1915. Page 30.

7. To determine the amount and kind of bodily movement which is most valuable in order to secure certain results in the audience and to secure the best growth in the speaker.
8. To vary the methods of teaching and to note the corresponding results in the students."

In the light of these stimulating suggestions, most of them directed toward experimental analysis of the audience under stimulation of the speaker, it is a curious fact that examination of the past issues of the Journal indicates so few genuine attempts to attack the important problems in this field. An examination of text-books in our field reveals the interesting fact that the authors have been content to avoid the arduous tasks of experimentation and to take from Psychology certain "settled facts," concerning which the psychologists themselves do not agree. This wholesale acceptance of hypotheses as being psychological facts, is chiefly true of those writers who have applied so enthusiastically to Speech education the unproved tenets of Behaviorism.

Undoubtedly, the principal reason for this unscientific attitude and for the prevalent lazy method of attempting to get at the facts by generalized observation of audience and speaker, has been ignorance of the techniques developed in other fields for study of attitude and opinion. When in the course of an article on the "Need for Research", Winans stated [3], "The whole psychology of persuasion needs labor", he enunciated a fact which has not become any the less distressing by reason of the efforts of teachers of Speech within the last sixteen years since the statement was published. In the related fields of political science, sociology, and psychology, however, the problem has been attacked properly and with vigor, though the attack has been limited to analysis of the character and formation of attitude and opinion in relations other than those of speaker and audience. The following pages, which are devoted to an analysis of pertinent literature in those fields, will discuss and evaluate the comparatively meager contribution of "experimenters" from the ranks of teachers of speech who have thought it worth their while to study audience reaction.

[3] J. A. Winans: "The Need for Research," *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking;* Vol. 1, April 1915, page 21.

Observers who report the results of research in the etiology of "opinion", indicate a wide diversity in the meanings attached to the more frequently used term, "attitude". Though, in the main, they study the same kind of data, most writers use interchangeably the terms: attitude, trait, opinion, wish, interest, disposition, desire, bias, preference, prejudice, will, sentiment, motive, objective, goal, idea, ideal, emotion, and sometimes even instinct and reflex. P. M. Symonds[4] gives seven common meanings of "attitude": great organic drives, purposes, or motives; muscular adjustment; generalized conduct; neural set or readiness to adjust; emotional response; feeling; and verbal accepting or rejecting responses.

This paper will deal with studies of "attitude" as it is found expressed in Opinion, since the facts established by these methods will contribute to our knowledge of the audience-speaker relationship. With the universality of meaning attached to the term "attitude", the various techniques in use should be of value in the study of audience reaction.

Since this paper is dealing with studies of Attitude as expressed in Opinion, only those techniques dealing with the distribution and change of opinions will be explained in detail. It may be useful, however, to indicate the character and extent of other types of studies of Attitude.

These studies may be broadly classified as follows according to the method of approach:

1. Direct observation of stimulus and response.
   a. Scales for measurement of attitude, best exemplified by the "Thurstone Scale".[5]
   b. "Social Distance" methods invented by Bogardus.[6]
   c. Questionnaire method; asking people for likes, or dislikes and motives actuating past acts; obtaining verbal reactions to imaginary situations which might arise in the future.
   d. Rank-order method of classifying opinions on separate

[4] P. M. Symonds: "What is an Attitude," *Psychological Bulletin;* Vol. 24, 1927, pp. 200–201. *Ibid: "The Nature of Conduct;"* N. Y., Macmillan, 1928, pp. 216–239.

[5] L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave: *The Measurement of Attitude;* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1929.

[6] E. S. Bogardus: "Measuring Social Distance," *Journal of Applied Sociology;* Vol. 9, 1925, pp. 299–308.

political or social questions; best exemplified in the Allport "scale".[7]

e. Presentations of different stimuli in life-situations, and recording of overt behavior responses; best exemplified by the Hartshorne and May "Studies in Deceit".[8]

f. Observation of group behavior; such as mob action or expressions of approval and disapproval by the audience.

g. The ballot technique, which records shift of opinion in a specific group under varying conditions of stimulation.[9]

2. Indirect methods; inference as to opinion from observed response without adequate observation of the stimulus.

a. Studies of historical trends in opinion upon political, economic, religious, and social subjects, as they appear in past events.

b. Analyses of data indirectly reflective of attitudes: i. e. political campaign appeals, election registrations and voting returns, newspaper editorials, news content, advertisements, and circulation, theatre attendance, library circulation, and purchases of commodities dependent upon activities, interests of social habits.

c. "Life-History" studies of individuals.

3. Composite Methods; direct and indirect observation.

a. Questionnaire; on which the subject checks a list of specified acts performed within a definite time in the past.

b. Case Study method; recently applied to a study of groups.[10]

All of these studies and methods are subject to the criticism that they cannot give a complete picture of the formation and character of public opinion or audience reaction; they can, at least, add to what we know. With the exception of the work of Bogardus[11], the overt behavior, and the ballot techniques, the methods are less valuable to research workers in the field of Speech by reason of the fact that

[7] F. H. Allport and D. A. Hartman: "The Measurement of Atypical Opinion in a Certain Group," *The American Political Science Review;* Vol. XIX, 1925, pp. 735–760.

[8] H. Hartshorne and M. May: *Studies in Deceit;* N. Y., Macmillan, 1928.

[9] H. S. Woodward: "Measurement and Analysis of Audience Opinion," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XIV, February 1928, pp. 94–111.

[10] R. S. and H. M. Lynd: *Middletown, a Study in Contemporary American Culture;* N. Y., Harcourt, 1929.

[11] E. S. Bogardus: "Analyzing Changes in Public Opinion," *Sociological and Social Research;* Vol. XII, 1928, pp. 279–285.

they deal with the status and distribution of attitude and opinion as it appears in verbal reactions to hypothetical or supposed situations, rather than with the formation of opinion or feeling in an actual life situation. This paper will not discuss further those techniques which cannot be applied directly to the speaker-audience relationship, since those methods which have a merely indirect bearing upon material within the field of Speech can be more productively employed by workers in other fields.

The most useful methods are those developed by E. S. Bogardus, by L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave, and by H. S. Woodward. No further explanation will be made concerning the overt-behavior method of recording responses in life-situations, though it is important and could be applied to a study of the speaking situation; a complete description of the method as applied in other fields can be found in Hartshorne and May's "Studies in Service and Self-Control".[12]

The Bogardus method in its simplest form secures a rapid subjective estimate of the degree of intimacy which a given person would permit for different races, nationalities, and individuals of varying stations in life. For example, the subject checks, on the form, provided, one of several degrees of intimacy to which he would permit various listed "foreigners" to enter his country, to become citizens, to become members of his church, to reside on his street, to become his neighbor, to become a fellow-employee, to become a fellow club-member, to become a personal chum, or to kinship by marriage. This and other similar methods of determining the bias or prejudice of a given individual could be used to ascertain to what extent bias or prejudice enters into reaction to the speaker. The prolific efforts of Bogardus, and his associates, since the invention of the technique in 1925, have produced significant results by this method, because it secures immediate response to specific stimuli. It is open to the criticism that we do not know the correlation between verbal response and actual behavior.

By far the most important of the verbal attitude studies has been the various attempts to construct an attitude scale, to which any specific attitude or opinion could be related for specific scale values.

[12] H. Hartshorne and M. A. May: *Studies in Service and Self-Control;* N. Y., Macmillan, 1929.

Thurstone[13] is the only one who has succeeded in creating such a scale but the pioneering attempt was made by Allport and Hartman[14], from whom Thurstone received his own idea.[15]

The Allport method was somewhat as follows: students were asked to write out opinions on various political issues; Allport selected some of these opinions for each subject (for example, Prohibition); these opinions were arranged in a "scale" or in a series ranging from extreme conservative to extreme liberal, with intermediate opinions; Allport and his colleagues then arranged the opinions for each subject in a rank-order series in accordance with the estimated degree of conservatism; in a final series each statement was given a serial number; then each student was asked to check the *one* statement which most nearly represented his own opinion about the particular subject studied; a frequency count was then made of endorsements for each of the statements on that subject; a column diagram indicated graphically the number of indorsements (on the ordinate) for each serial number (on the abscissa), representing a statement in the rank-order series. Allport and Hartman used sixty upper-class students to write views on the League of Nations, the Qualifications of Coolidge, Distribution of Wealth, Legislative Control of Supreme Court, Prohibition, Ku Klux Klan, and Graft in Politics; they thus obtained seven "scales" of range of opinion. The seven scales were submitted to 367 students for checking, with the addition that the students were asked to indicate the intensity of conviction. This rank-order method is obviously suitable for analysis of the opinion-distribution within the audience upon a specific subject.

The so-called "scale", however, is open to the criticism that it is a mere rank-order series; consequently there is no means of knowing whether the thirteen statements on Prohibition, for example, have the same actual relationship as that indicated by the thirteen integers on the base line of the scale. On a base line of thirteen inches, the addition of one new statement, the subtraction of some of them, or a difference of opinion as to the rank order of the statements, will

[13] No. 5, supra.

[14] No. 7, supra.

[15] L. L. Thurstone: "The Measurement of Opinion," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology;* Vol. 22, 1927, pp. 415–430.

change the relationship and linear separation of any two statements. Further, since the locations on the base line of the diagram are merely rank orders, we cannot calculate a central tendency or dispersion of opinion in a group. Thurstone tries to correct this defect by constructing a rational method of assigning values for the base line of a scale of opinion.[15]

The Thurstone-Chave scale is an attempt to apply in the fields of attitude and opinion, principles developed by psychophysicists. The procedure may be described as follows: several groups of people and many individuals are asked to write out opinions about a specific institution or subject (for example, the Church), and the current literature is searched for suitable brief statements; Thurstone edits the material and secures a list of 130 statements or more (along an attitude variable more or less in favor of the Church), ranging from extremely favorable to extremely opposed; these statements are submitted to several hundred judges for sorting into eleven classes to represent an evenly graduated series of attitudes from those extremely against the Church to those very much in favor of the Church. The eleven classes of opinion are not described to the judges (except that the two extreme positions and the neutral positions are labeled on master slips under which opinions are to be sorted); each judge is asked to indicate by number the two statements in each of the eleven classes which seemed most representative of that class. Returns of each judge are tabulated so that it is known exactly where he placed each statement submitted; this is summarized in a table for all judges and the percentage of indorsements for each statement in each of the eleven classes is calculated. Proportions of ratings for each class and statment are plotted on rectangular axes, with eleven scale positions as abscissas and accumulative proportions as ordinates; the resulting accumulative curve for each proposition, resembling the ogive, is smoothed; the scale value of the statement is taken as that point on the X axis where the curve shows an interpolated accumulative total of fifty percent of the cases; so that the scale value is in terms of eleven equidistant positions, into which the base-line has been arbitrarily divided. Subjects who placed 30 or more of the 130 statements in one class were eliminated as being careless or indifferent; the number of scale steps between the quartile points on each curve is taken as the measure of ambiguity, on the principle that if the statement is very ambiguous, there will be a wide dispersion of

endorsement over the scale steps—and such statements are dropped from the final list. Each statement is given a scale value (that step-interval on which there were fifty percent of the endorsements for the statement), and a Q-value (the range of scale steps between the quartile points); unsuitable statements were eliminated from the final scale by this criterion of ambiguity (Q value)[16] and by the criterion of irrelevance[17] (a graphical method of indicating that there was a general tendency of both high and low scale subjects to endorse statement X); by these criteria and by inspection, a final list of 45 statements of opinion were selected from the original list of 130 opinions (in the scale for the Church). These statements were then submitted to several hundred subjects for actual voting. A similar scale has been prepared for the subject of War; both scales are available for experimental use to determine fundamental bias of the audience. The scale represents the psychophysical method of equal-appearing intervals, and in the opinion of Thurstone, "three hundred subjects are quite sufficient to stabilize scale-values"; the discrepancies for scale values for 300 subjects as compared with scale values for 150 subjects were found insignificant.[18]

The elaborate statistical and precautionary methods taken to secure a rational and valid scale of equi-distant steps by the elimination of statements which indicate lack of uniformity in the sorting process or which indicate an inconsistency in the indorsing process, by making the statements brief so as not to fatigue the subjects who are asked to read the whole list, by phrasing the statements to permit the reader to reject or indorse in accordance with his personal attitude, by selection of statements which compel the reader to express an attitude on the issue in question (not merely to endorse a statement of fact as a fact), by avoiding the double-barreled statements unless necessary to express neutrality, by selection of statements in relation to an attitude variable or specific phase of the general subject, by use of a large enough number of statements to insure a fair sampling of opinion on this phase of the general subject, by asking the sorting judge not to express his own opinion or belief but to sort

[16] Thurstone, L. L. and Chave, E. J.: *Measurement of Attitude;* No. 5, supra, pp. 44–45.

[17] *Ibid;* pp. 45–56.

[18] *Ibid;* page 44.

opinions into eleven piles, by elimination of 40 out of 341 sorters who placed 30 or over of the 130 statements in one of the eleven piles (to get rid of the careless or indifferent), by selection of opinions to reflect the present attitude of the subject rather than past attitudes, by avoidance of statements applicable to a very restricted range of indorsers (involving factual qualification or personal facts about the indorser), by discarding in the beginning statements that seem to have double-meaning, or statements which could be indorsed by subjects from both ends of the scale, by avoidance of related and confused concepts such as "true religion", by using a large number of sorters of opinions into the scale steps—all tend to make this method an important contribution in the exact and rational application of psychophysical theory to the construction of an opinion scale.

In the construction of this scale, Thurstone freely makes seven assumptions[19]:

a. A single numerical index is as good a measure of a complex attitude as it is for measuring a table, for in each case it can be stated what particular aspect is to be measured.

b. Opinions are a means of measuring attitudes, of which they are a symbol; there is no greater chance of error in taking opinion as an index of attitude than in taking physical indices for volume and temperature; opinions are merely verbalized attitudes.

c. It is worth knowing what people *say* that they believe even if their conduct turns out to be inconsistent with their professed opinions.

d. People's attitudes are subject to change; measurement on any issue is not an enduring constant and the scale can be used to measure the change in attitude with the passage of time.

e. The attitude scale will be used only in those situations in which one may reasonably expect people to tell the truth about their convictions or opinions (where there is a minimum of pressure).

f. The fact that the subject may consciously hide his true attitude will not seriously interfere with interpretation of the attitudes expressed, if users of the scale will minimize as far as possible the conditions which prevent subjects from telling the truth.

[19] *Ibid;* pp. 5–11.

g. It is immaterial that opinions are multidimensional and cannot all be represented in a linear continuum; this is true of beauty, mechanical skill, and physical measurements.

Consideration of these assumptions does not seem to affect its validity as a statistical scale of equal steps for measuring distribution of attitude, as it is expressed in opinion. In the two forms of the "Church" scale, where 200 Freshmen were used, a correlation between the two sets of scores of 0.848 was obtained; by the Spearman-Brown formula there is an estimated reliability of the whole scale of 0.92; this was in effect a self-correlation of two-halves of the one scale.[20]

The limitation of the use of the scale is that in creating a new scale for a given subject, it is too laborious and costly a process to obtain 300 expert judges to sort opinions on a wide variety of topics. The scale techniques must largely be restricted to studies of institutions like the Church or to studies of generalized attitudes about the economic system or war, or similar subjects. The social, fraternal, or business club, or labor organization is not likely to submit either to acting as a sorting judge or to acting as subjects except in rare instances. The scale is more likely to be useful in class-rooms, religious conferences, and small discussion clubs than in the ordinary life-situation; here, it can be used to advantage as a means of determining the fundamental bias of the audience before stimulation from the speaker. Despite its limited applicability, the Thurstone-Chave scale is the most valid method yet devised for recording, analysing, and measuring the distribution or attitude and opinion on current political, economic and social questions. It is unfortunate that the very detailed and rigorous technique, which makes the psycho-physical method valid in Thurstone's hands, should constitute a limitation on the use of the scale in what has been called the "work-a-day groupings of society".

A few investigators have attempted to study gross movements of opinion and shifts in attitude in the speaking situation. The most significant of these studies involved the use of some form of ballot to register opinion before and after stimulation; this was first suggested by W. E. Utterback in 1922.[21] The most extensive study is

[20] *Ibid;* pp. 65–66.

[21] W. E. Utterback: "Measuring the Reaction of the Audience to an Argu-

that reported by H. S. Woodward [22] who used the ballot technique with thirty-five hundred non-student subjects to record shift of opinion within definite groups under stimulation of speakers who discussed political or social questions pro and con. G. B. Willey and S. A. Rice[23], S. A. Rice[24], Burtt[25], Collins[26], D. Young[27], G. B. Watson[28], and F. H. Allport[29], have made similar but less significant experimental use of the ballot to record changes in opinion with change in stimulation. These studies suggest the unique experiment of F. H. Allport[30], to determine the effect of group influence upon the amount and quality of arguments produced by controversial passages from Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. None of these studies indicate an adequate control of the variable factors affecting shift of opinion; so that the hypothesis that the ballot can be used to measure objectively opinion response to specific rather than to general stimuli is still open to question.

Disadvantages in using the ballot to record opinion change in life-situations are two:

a. The ballot cannot attempt to determine the degree of conviction nor the position of a particular attitude or opinion on an

mentative Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education;* Vol. VIII, April 1922, pp. 180–183.

[22] No. 9, supra.

[23] G. B. Willey and S. A. Rice: "W. J. Bryan as a Social Force," *Social Forces,* Vol. 2, 1924, pp. 338–344.

[24] S. A. Rice: "Differential Changes of Political Preference under Campaign Stimulation," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology;* Vol. XXI, 1926, pp. 297–303.

[25] H. E. Burtt: "Sex Differences in the Effect of Discussion," *Journal of Experimental Psychology;* 1920, Vol. II, pp. 390–395.

[26] G. R. Collins: "The Relative Effectiveness of Condensed and Extended Motive Appeal," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education,* Vol. X, June 1924, pp. 221–230.

[27] D. Young: "Some Effects of a Course in American Race Problems on Race Prejudice of 450 Undergraduates of the University of Pennsylvania," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology;* Vol. XXII, 1927, pp. 235–242.

[28] G. B. Watson: Appendix, *Proceedings of the Seventh National Country Life Conference;* Chicago, University Press, 1925, pp. 208–212.

[29] F. H. Allport: *Social Psychology;* Cambridge Riverside Press, 1924, page 289.

[30] *Ibid:* "The Influence of the Group upon Association and Thought," *Journal of Experimental Psychology;* Vol. 3, 1920, pp. 159–166. *Ibid: Social Psychology;* 1924 Cambridge Riverside Press, pp. 265–290.

attitude scale having equi-distant steps, such as in the Thurstone-Chave scale.

b. It cannot give us directly adequate information as to the fundamental bases for the opinion held by the particular voter, nor the amount of information upon which the opinion is based.

To overcome these limitations it may be possible to combine other attitude techniques with that of the ballot, but the average audience cannot be persuaded to endure a very elaborate procedure such as would become necessary.

Certain definite advantages appear, however, so that we find psychologists recommending its use in studying opinion of non-student populations; both Kimball Young[31] and Reed Bain[32] prefer the ballot technique to all others in studying attitudes and opinions. The advantages are as follows:

a. It secures a record of individual reaction to a definite proposition before and after stimulation.

b. It records overt adjustment behavior rather than verbal behavior in a reaction to an imaginary situation. The voter is not asked to state motives for past acts, nor how he would act in the future if the situation arose, nor to select opinions from a large number on a scale ranging from "radical" to "reactionary"; he votes his "present" opinion on a definite proposition placed before him.

c. It permits study of shift of opinion in non-student populations in an actual life situation; other techniques are either too unwieldy for convenient use with the popular audience, or when so used lack statistical and experimental validity.

d. It has a standardized form and is an easily administered method to be used for recording shift of opinion. The form of ballot devised by H. S. Woodward, and incorporated by him in the article referred to above, has been the most widely used of those suggested.

e. The number of choices before and after stimulation are few and equal, so that a unitary response regarding a given proposition may be made. The voter has the choice of expressing opinion in one of three possible ways before and after dis-

[31] K. Young: *Social Psychology;* N. Y., Knopf, 1930, pp. 585-594.

[32] R. Bain: "Theory and Measurement of Attitudes and Opinions." *Psychological Bulletin;* Vol. XXVII, May 1930, pp. 357-368.

cussion by the speaker. There is greater probability that an "attitude" is actually expressed regarding the specific proposal, than if the voter should be asked to select from several possible opinions on a scale. The most valid of the "scale techniques" (Thurstone's), would require several different scales to be constructed and voted upon before we could get a unitary response, since each scale is built upon an "attitude variable," which limits the sampling of opinions to specific phases of a given subject.

f. It records change rather than status of opinion.

The ballot can be applied directly to the Audience-Speaker situation; opinion change can be analysed by varying the type of stimulation given the audience by the speaker. It would be difficult to use the ballot technique with fruitful results in other than the audience situation; use of the ballot in newspaper and periodical polls or with radio audiences gives no evaluation of the sampling error. It seems therefore likely that if the ballot technique is to be used for objective experimental attack on factors underlying public opinion, it will largely be limited to study of the audience and it must be concerned largely with shift rather than with the scale-distribution of opinion. Use of the ballot, however, it by no means restricted to the student speaking situation. It has already been applied over longer periods of time i.e. to ascertain the effect of campaign stimulation[33], of a college curricular course[34], and of a three-day conference[35]. It is conceivable that these studies could be made valid by extending them under adequate statistical procedure.

Any-one who takes the trouble to examine the text-books in our field and the periodicals which have contained articles devoting some space to the Audience, will find that none of the text-books and few of the articles are experimental in character or report experimental work already done in the audience-speaker field. Yet any teacher of Speech can in a few moments time compile a list of the factors

[33] S. A. Rice: *supra*, No. 24.

[34] D. Young: *supra*, No. 27.

[35] G. B. Watson: "Results of Tests on Opinions on Religion in Country Life." Appendix, *Proceedings of the Seventh National Country Life Conference*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1925, pp. 208–212. Obtainable from the American Country Life Association, Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

said by the authors to "influence" opinion: concreteness, struggle, suspense, the personal, surprise, antagonism, curiosity, monotony, variety, humor, imagery, personality, physique, temperament, character, social facilitation, social pressure, bias, emotion, information, attitude or motor set, physical contact of audience-members, prestige, confidence, repetition, inference, slogans, vividness, fear, sense of personal responsibility, desire for approval, tact, arousing prejudice, opposition to "fixed fundamental principles," size of audience, relative "strength" of motives, sentiments, tastes, the occasion mental set of the audience, action of the speaker, variety in force (or in emphasis, quality, pitch and rate), devices to secure attention, use of the familiar, human traits, conversational mode, et cetera ad infinitum. But as to quantitative and experimental determination of the relation of these factors to each other and to formation of Opinion, there is an almost complete lack.

The only truly experimental or statistical studies actually reported in Speech journals and publications, concerning the audience field are those of G. R. Collins[36] who studied the preferences of 277 college students for different degrees of motive appeal experimentally introduced into the development of speeches; of C. H. Woolbert[37], who investigated the effects of various modes of public reading; of R. West and H. Larsen[38] who reported a statistical study of the correlation between ability to judge and ability to perform; of W. E. Utterback[39], who suggested a means of measuring the "reaction of the audience to an argumentative speech"; of D. Hayworth[40], who tabulated the different kinds of material used by 145 political speakers in presidential campaigns from 1884 to 1920; of L. S. Judson[41] who studied respiratory changes in members of the audience under

[36] G. R. Collins: *supra*, No. 26.

[37] C. H. Woolbert: "Effects of Various Modes of Public Reading," *Journal of Applied Psychology;* Vol. 4, 1920, pp. 162–185. Review on pages 292–297 in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education;* Vol. VII, June 1921.

[38] R. West and H. Larsen: "Statistical Investigations in the Field of Speech," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education;* Vol. VII, Nov. 1921.

[39] W. E. Utterback: No. 21, *supra.*

[40] D. Hayworth: "An Analysis of Speeches in Presidential Campaigns from 1884 to 1920," *Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XVI, Feb. 1930, pp. 35–42.

[41] L. S. Judson: "Objective Studies of the Influence of the Speaker on the Audience," *Journal of Expression;* Vol. IV, March, 1930, pp. 1-11.

influence of the speaker; of R. N. Thompson[42] who sought to ascertain the correlation between the Intelligence Quotient of High School debaters and their ability to perform; of J. Dolman[43] who reported tabulation of the varying amount of laughter and applause produced line by line by different presentations of "The School for Scandal"; of F. H. Knower[44], who reports the use of psychological tests as applied to public speaking; of W. E. Stevens[45] who devised a "rating scale" for public speakers; and that of H. S. Woodward[46], who devised a standardized form of ballot for recording shift of opinion in the debating situation and used it with some 3500 voters in popular audiences. It should be noted that there are only four instances of experimental work involving controlled change of stimulus as presented to the audience: the studies of Collins, Woolbert, Judson, and West and Larsen. Consultation of a bibliography of texts and articles on Speech will indicate that our "progress" beyond the *Rhetorica* has added very little to the sum total of quantitative data concerning audience reaction.

Conflicting evidence exists that teachers of Speech are alive to the importance of studying audience response and to the problems involved in the measurement of audience response. All too few of the articles referred to constitute a scientific and valid experimental attack upon the problems presented. The report of H. A. Wichelns[47], as head of the Committee on Research in 1923, devotes most of its space to Speech Correction, Voice Science, Speech Education, Speech Composition, Dramatics and Oratory, dismissing with a word what he calls "Observational Study of Audiences". J. M. O'Neill[48] in a

[42] R. N. Thompson: "The Intelligence of High School Debaters," *Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XVII, June 1931, pp. 403–405.

[43] J. Dolman: "A Laugh Analysis of 'The School for Scandal'," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XVI, Nov. 1930, pp. 432–445.

[44] F. H. Knower: "Psychological Tests in Public Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XV, April 1929, pp. 216–222.

[45] W. E. Stevens: "A Rating Scale for Public Speakers," *Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XIV, April 1928, pp. 223–232.

[46] H. S. Woodward: No. 9, *supra.*

[47] H. A. Wichelns: "Research," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education;* Vol. IX, June 1923, pp. 232–240.

[48] J. M. O'Neill: "A Bibliographical Introduction to Graduate Work in Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education;* Vol. XIII, Feb. 1927, pp. 39–48.

"Bibliographical Introduction to Graduate Work in Speech," gives little attention to the psychology of speech and still less to audience reaction (page 44), though he had already devoted whole articles to Speech Correction (Feb. 1924), to Classical Rhetoric (June, 1926), and American Oratory (Nov. 1926). There can be little doubt that he was faithfully reporting what he had found in the literature to be the major interests of teachers of Speech. While C. T. Simon[49] discusses at length laboratory procedure for study of sound-source, propagation, elements of tone-production, vocal apparatus, et cetera, he makes no reference to research in audience reaction. As late as 1927, we find Paget pointing out[50] how little work had been done with "Suggestion," and suggesting experimentation. In a more recent article M. Dickens[51] gives a trenchant criticism of the naive acceptance by speech text-writers of the "group mind" fallacy taken over from questionable psychological sources, such as Le Bon and Tarde. Even Woolbert, writing as a psychologist[52] uses qualitative analysis entirely in discussing "The Audience"! Most typical is the recent article[53] by W. M. Parrish who gives a careful analysis of Gestalt theory as applied to speech but indicates nothing as to the experimental validity of the conclusions he promulgated; the Gestalt psychologist would not claim so much, for his hypotheses.

Yet there seems to be no adequate reason which would operate to prevent the worker in the field of Speech from using the techniques developed for study of attitude or opinion. The most serviceable technique for study of opinion-change in the audience in a life-situation was developed by H. S. Woodward, a teacher of Speech. A series of experiments conducted by the writer at Western Reserve University, in order to determine if a radical change in the mode of speaking will be accompanied by a correlated change in opinion in-

[49] C. T. Simon: "Laboratory Courses for Advanced Undergraduates," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education;* Vol. XIII, Feb. 1927, pp. 7–15.

[50] E. H. Paget: "Suggestion," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education:* Vol. XIII, June 1927, pp. 275–278.

[51] M. Dickens: "The Group Fallacy and Public Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XVII, Feb. 1931, pp. 40–49.

[52] C. H. Woolbert: "The Audience," *Psychological Monographs;* No. 92, University of Illinois Studies, XXI, 1916, pp. 36–54.

[53] W. M. Parrish: "The Implications of Gestalt Psychology," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Vol. XIV, Feb. 1928, pp. 8–29.

dependently of other variable factors affecting opinion as it is expressed upon a ballot, has been approved by the Psychological Department as having scientific validity. It seems reasonable to believe that experimentation in the speaker-audience field can best be done by those who understand the processes involved in changing the mode of speaking.

The writer has attempted to indicate that definite techniques exist which will permit experimental study of the audience under controlled conditions in life-situations, that the worker in the Speech field is far behind his "social science" cousins in applying these techniques through experiment, and that the time is coming when quantitative methods instead of qualitative empirical observation will be applied to study of the audience-speaker relationship.

COWPER ON CONVERSATION

RAYMOND F. HOWES
Washington University

WILLIAM COWPER belonged to an age that took its conversation seriously. From top to bottom, English society in the Eighteenth Century was divided and sub-divided into little knots of talkers. Courtiers had their levees and routs, nobles and wits their clubs, intellectual ladies their salons, butchers and bakers their nightly gatherings in favorite coffee-houses. It was fashionable for a host or hostess to receive a group of talkative friends before rising in the morning; it was the habit of confirmed wits to spend the evening debating at Will's or the Bedford. From palace to alley, from morning to night, conversation flourished.

It flourished in part because it was consciously cultivated. Aspiring wits kept common-place books in which they recorded epigrams, jokes, anecdotes, and puns. Others, anxious to be thought scholarly, spent hours studying. Still others trained themselves in gesture and became mimics or buffoons.

Nor was such effort unwarranted, for to be a wit was to have a profession. One who excelled in repartee often became "familiar and domestic with persons of the first quality, and was usually sent

for at every meeting to divert the company." [1] The art of pleasing in conversation was the first requisite of a diplomat. Fame, if not fortune, was to be won in the coffee-houses and salons, as Addison, Steele, Pope, Swift, and Dr. Johnson well knew, and the position of symposiarch at a club was an honor not to be lightly scorned. Ladies coveting social and intellectual distinction, like Mrs. Montagu and Mrs. Elizabeth Vesey, attained it by leading conversations in their drawing-rooms.

No evidence as to the serious concern of the age with conversation is more convincing, however, than the abundance of written comment. No detail was too trivial to find a place in an essay, letter, play, or poem. Goldsmith worried about "the modern manner of some of our nobility receiving company in their morning gowns." [2] Lady Louisa Stuart criticized the arrangement of furniture at Mrs. Montagu's salon: "Everything in that house . . . was sure to form itself into a circle or semi-circle." [3] Mrs. Ord recorded her opinion that a table is "the best friend to sociable conversation." [4]

Such minutiae as the kind and amount of refreshments proper at a conversation party became subjects of argument. Hannah More praised a party at the Pepys's because "the spirit of the evening was kept up on the strength of a little lemonade till past eleven." Dr. Johnson, in contrast, declared that "a man does not love to go to a place from whence he comes out exactly as he went in," and advised Mrs. Thrale to "give sweetmeats, and such good things, in an evening." [5] Lord Chesterfield wrote page after page of advice to his son, telling him, in precise detail, how to converse.

So anxious was Swift to improve the conversation of his acquaintances that he carefully listed their faults in "Hints toward an Essay on Conversation" and later, not content with that, went into

[1] Swift: "Hints toward an essay on Conversation," *The Prose Work of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. by Truple Scott, vol. XI. This essay includes pp. 67–75.

[2] *Citizen of the World*, Letter 77.

[3] Home's *Lady Louisa Stuart*, p. 158. This is quoted, as are many of the passages used in this introduction, in C. B. Tinker's *The Salon and English Letters*. New York, 1915 (The Macmillan Co.).

[4] Quoted by Tinker, p. 159.

[5] This quarrel is given in Tinker, p. 111. See also Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, ed. by W. D. Howe, p. 345.

society with a notebook to compile, after more than a decade of careful observation, a *Complete Collection of Genteel and Ingenious Conversation*, probably the most scathingly ironical tract on this subject ever written. Addison contributed definitions of various kinds of talk, such as the pedantic and the lute-like. In this he was abetted by Steele, who lauded excellent conversation as "a degree towards the life of the angels." Pope joined the chorus, as did Cowper. But perhaps the most notable bit of evidence showing how much conversation meant to Eighteenth Century Englishmen is that Boswell, when he desired to write a life of Dr. Johnson, could think of no better preparation than to make a meticulous record, day by day, of the great man's talk. Boswell's work proves beyond a doubt that he and Johnson, like the others, thought the art of conversing a serious study worthy of their highest efforts.

Out of this mass of comment, description, satire, irony, and advice emerge three distinct points of view concerning the nature of talk. Talk to some, as to Lord Chesterfield, is a means of gaining favorable recognition in society; to others, as to Swift, it is a recreation that might be pleasant if there were fewer fools in the world; to the more religious, as to Cowper, it is a divine privilege constantly abused.

Cowper's works on conversation have been handicapped in the struggle for attention. They cannot, as can Lord Chesterfield's *Letters to His Son* or Swift's *Polite Conversation*, claim a great deal on the score of literary excellence. His youthful essays for the *Connoisseur* are neither masterful nor easy to obtain.[6] His poem, "Conversation," is not first rate verse. His letters are admired for other reasons than their occasional allusions to talk. Yet for a well-rounded conception of Eighteenth Century comment on conversation, these works form an essential supplement to those of Lord Chesterfield and Swift. Only a critic of great temerity would venture to assume that as a writer on conversation any one of them far outshines the others.[7]

[6] Several of them have never, so far as I can discover, been attributed to him by critics and biographers. He himself was so doubtful of their worth that he claimed only three out of the ten or more that he probably wrote.

[7] For this reason, I was surprised to find no reference to Cowper in Miss Heseltine's *Conversation*, Mr. Taft's *Essay on the Art of Conversation*, or Mr. Priestley's *Talking*. One of the primary motives for writing this paper was to fill this gap in these recent books.

Cowper had one distinct advantage over the other two. Although he often disagreed with Swift and thoroughly despised Lord Chesterfield,[8] he had their ideas at his command. Of the two, Swift exerted by far the more powerful influence. In fact, most of Cowper's early essays were inspired by his works. At that time (1754-1756) Cowper was a resident of London, a frequenter of coffee-houses, a member of a conversation club (the Nonsense Club, which included George Colman and Bonnell Thornton, joint-editors of the *Connoisseur*), and was trying desperately to appear a man of the world.[9] His environment was therefore similar to that of Swift, and it was natural that he should turn to *Polite Conversation* and the *Miscellanies* for suggestions. Nevertheless, he put into these essays the results of some careful personal observation. The fund of general ideas and specific details thus accumulated served him well when he came to attempt his more important work, the poem "Conversation."

When Cowper wrote this poem (July and August, 1781), he was a very different person from the aspiring wit of his London days. For sixteen years he had been living in the villages of Huntingdon and Olney under the direct influence of a group of religious enthusiasts. Most of this time he had been under the same roof with Mrs. Morley Unwin, the widow of a minister and the mother of another. One of his closest friends had been that austere cleric, the Rev. John Newton, at whose request he had composed his "Olney Hymns." Day after day he had taken part in conversations about the Gospels, until he could listen patiently to nothing else. He actually criticized his brother John because, on a visit to Olney, he talked of more mundane things: "So much said about nothing, and so little about Jesus, is very painful to us, but what can be done?"[10]

Happily, however, he had not lost his sense of humor, his habit of close observation, or his gift for characterization, which had lent interest, if not distinction, to several of his essays in the *Connoisseur*.[11] Nor had he abandoned his reading. It seems certain that he read

[8] See ll. 341-346 of *"The Progress of Error."*

[9] His chief trouble was bashfulness in company.

[10] Letter to Mrs. Madan, June 28, 1768, Cowper's *Correspondence*, ed. by Thomas Wright, I, 103.

[11] Notably No. 119, "On Keeping a Secret"; No. 111, "Containing the character of the delicate Billy Suckling"; and No. 115, a letter from Christopher Ironsides.

Lord Chesterfield's *Letters to His Son* shortly before starting "Conversation," for his denunciation of that gentleman had been written less than six months before.[12] It is also probable that he read Swift's "Hints toward an Essay on Conversation," which had first appeared in 1758, for his letters show that Swift remained, throughout his life, one of his favorite authors. Besides this, he had made the acquaintance of a variety of village people, whose eccentricities, especially those concerned with conversation, he keenly observed and often recorded in his letters. Hence he had plenty of material both for the first part of the poem, which he consciously attempted to make "jocular" in order to gain readers, and for the "grave and sober" ending.[13] "Conversation," taken as a whole, is neither so serious nor so dull as might be expected.

The possible topics for any discussion of conversation are limited in number. If the writer attempts, as Swift did in "Hints toward an Essay on Conversation" and Cowper did in the first part of his poem, to mention the usual faults of talkers, he must, during most of the journey, tread a well-travelled path. It is to Cowper's credit, therefore, that besides speaking, like Swift, of *foolishness, obscenity, swearing, wrangling, dogmatism, duelling, telling long stories, lying, talking of oneself,* and *talking of sickness,* he was able to add *doubtfulness, the use of perfume, smoking, fretfulness, bashfulness,* and *talk about hunting.* He goes beyond Swift, too, in giving a positive concept of good conversation. The notion of using constructive criticism may have come from Lord Chesterfield; Cowper did not use it in his essay "On Conversation" in the *Connoisseur;* but his concept itself is distinctly different from that of the noble lord. Good conversation to Cowper meant uplifting talk about religion, such as Christ had with his disciples and he himself had had with Mrs. Unwin and the Rev. John Newton.

This almost painfully moral attitude toward the faculty of speech

[12] See note 8. The lines were written in January, 1781.

[13] These words are used by Cowper in a letter to Mrs. Newton in August, 1781. He says, "My design in it (*Conversation*) is to convince the world that they make but indifferent use of their tongues, considering the intention of Providence when He endued them with the faculty of speech; to point out the abuses, which is the jocular part of the business, and to prescribe the remedy, which is the grave and sober." *Correspondence,* I, 338.

comes out definitely near the beginning of the poem. Speech, he writes, is a divine gift, not to be lightly used.

> "Sacred interpreter of human thought,
> How few respect or use thee as they ought!
> But all shall give account of every wrong,
> Who dare dishonour or defile the tongue."[14]

Even talk about unimportant matters must be condemned.

> ". . . Language in the mouths of the adult—
> Witness its insignificant result—
> Too often proves an implement of play,
> A toy to sport with, and pass time away.

This fault is not by any means exclusively confined to country people,[16] but Cowper probably had his Olney acquaintances in mind when he wrote. The eccentric Olney schoolmaster, Samuel Teedon, whose various conversational failings are recorded at length in later portions of the poem, and Mr. Wilson, the barber, evidently talked a great deal of nonsense. "First came the barber," wrote Cowper of Wilson on one occasion, "who, after having embellished the outside of my head, has left the inside just as unfurnished as he found it."[17]

Turning now to graver subjects, Cowper lashes out at obscenity.

> "There is a prurience in the speech of some,
> Wrath stays him, or else God would strike them dumb."[18]

It appears that the reason for the Deity's forbearance is that the more times a person talks this way, the stronger punishment He can mete out in the hereafter. Neither the vigor of adolescence nor the infirmity of age offers an excuse. Swearing is not quite so reprehensible, if one may judge from Cowper's method of discussing it. He begins with a couplet that approaches humor:

> "Oaths terminate, as Paul observes, all strife—
> Some men have surely then a peaceful life."[19]

[14] Ll. 23-26. Cowper early assumed a more moralistic attitude toward conversation than Swift or Chesterfield. See the last paragraph of his Connoisseur essay No. 138, "On Conversation."

[15] Ll. 15-22.

[16] Swift had found it in London. See "Hints."

[17] Letter written July 27, 1780, quoted, p. 289, in Wright's *Life*.

[18] Ll. 31, 32. This topic is continued through line 54.

[19] Ll. 55, 56. The discussion of this subject includes 35 lines.

He goes on to argue that oaths are rhetorically ineffective; people who use them overshoot their mark, for

> ". . . . .even when sober truth prevails throughout,
> They swear it, till affirmance breeds a doubt."

Sometimes, too, curses are misunderstood. There is a story of a Persian who heard a profane lawyer make a speech and took him for a bishop. In summary, then,

> "Religion, virtue, reason, common sense,
> Pronounce your human form a false pretence,—
> A mere disguise, in which a devil lurks,
> Who yet betrays his secret by his works."

Cowper drops this moralistic tone to discuss the wrangler. He had simply found such a person disagreeable. His London friends, probably those in the Nonsense Club in particular, had liked to argue. His country friends must have liked it equally well, for Cowper's antipathy has lost nothing of its strength. The only essential difference seems to be that in the country he met one disputant at a time, whereas at the meetings of the Nonsense Club the argument must often have been general.

> "Ye powers who rule the tongue, if such there are,
> And make colloquial happiness your care,
> Preserve me from the thing I dread and hate,
> A duel in the form of a debate."[20]

There, indeed, is the cry of a man who has had bitter experience. One might almost think him a teacher of Speech. He goes on to explain, as calmly as may be, the reasons for his dislike.

> "The clash of argument and jar of words,
> Worse than the mortal brunt of rival swords,
> Decide no question with their tedious length,
> For opposition gives opinion strength,
> Divert the champions, prodigal of breath,
> And put the peaceably-disposed to death."

Not for long, however, can Cowper speak in general terms. The personal note comes back strongly.

> "Oh, thwart me not, Sir Soph, at every turn,
> Nor carp at every flaw you may discern;

[20] Ll. 81-84. The discussion of the wrangler continues to line 118.

Though syllogisms hang not on my tongue,
I am not surely always in the wrong!
'Tis hard if all is false that I advance,
A fool must now and then be right by chance."

The way to treat such a person? Here it is:

"I twirl my thumbs, fall back into my chair,
Fix on the wainscot a distressful stare,
And, when I hope his blunders are all out,
Reply discreetly—To be sure—no doubt!"

In the next twenty-five lines (119-144), Cowper pays his respects to Dubius, the person who never has a positive opinion, who

". . . . . would not, with a peremptory tone,
Assert the nose upon his face his own."

Different from Dubius, but as irritating, is the dogmatist.

"Where men of judgment creep and feel their way,
The positive pronounce without dismay;
. . . . . .
Without the means of knowing right from wrong,
They always are decisive, clear, and strong;
Where others toil with philosophic force,
Their nimble nonsense takes a shorter course,
Flings at your head conviction in a lump,
And gains remote conclusions at a jump."[21]

There seems to have been no single model for this picture. The very fact that the description is in the plural indicates, perhaps, that Cowper had a number of persons in mind. Doubtless some of his teachers at Westminister School have been deprived of immortality by his failure to be more specific.

After a fling at the custom of duelling, Cowper launches into a long passage on story telling. There is little doubt that Samuel Teedon was the innocent cause of most of these verses. A letter from Cowper to the Rev. John Newton on Feb. 25, 1781, describes one of Teedon's frequent visits and draws from that experience some general rules that afterward found their place in the poem.

In the four months between the date of this letter and the composition of "Conversation," Cowper had many more opportunities to

[21] Ll. 145-154.

observe Teedon in action. Hence the passage in the poem is more complete and shows, if anything, more feeling.

"A story, in which native humor reigns,
Is often useful, always entertains;
A graver fact, enlisted on your side,
May furnish illustration, well applied;
But sedentary weavers of long tales
Give me the fidgets, and my patience fails.
. . . . . .
A tale should be judicious, clear, succinct;
The language plain, and incidents well linked;
Tell not as new what everybody knows,
. . . . . .
And, new or old, still hasten to a close;
There centering in a focus round and neat,
Let all your rays of information meet:
What neither yields us profit nor delight
Is like a nurse's lullaby at night."[23]

In this section Cowper definitely breaks away from the method of Swift. Instead of pointing out faults exclusively, he puts the emphasis, as Chesterfield does, on constructive suggestions. Lord Chesterfield's influence is apparent, too, in the intervening passage, which deals with lying, although Cowper probably, as Wright suggests,[24] had Teedon still before his eyes;[25]

"The path of narrative with care pursue,
Still making probability your clue;
On all the vestiges of truth attend,
And let them guide you to a decent end.
Of all ambitions man may entertain,
The worst that can invade a sickly brain,
Is that which angles hourly for surprise,
And baits its hook with prodigies and lies.

[22] Cowper's *Correspondence*, I, 274.

[23] Ll. 203-216, 235-242. Although, as has been noted, Cowper had a specific talker in mind when he wrote these verses, he parallels closely a passage in Chesterfield's *Letters*. In Letter XVII Chesterfield says, "Do not tell stories in company; there is nothing more tedious and disagreeable; if by chance you know a very short story, and exceedingly applicable to the present subject of conversation, tell it in as few words as possible." p. 26.

[24] *Life*, p. 378.

[25] Letter XIV. Chesterfield's discussion resembles Cowper's closely.

Peculiarly personal is Cowper's next passage (ll. 245-268). He condemns smoking on the grounds that it interferes with the completion of thought, making "half a sentence at a time enough," that it makes the smoker drowsy, and that it is offensive to women. The only sensible use of tobacco is to poison bugs on plants. It arouses a thirst that can be quenched only by liquor; and when men drink, they become more than ever disgusting to women,

> "For seaborn Venus her attachment shows
> Still to that element from which she rose,
> And, with a quiet which no fumes disturb,
> Sips meek infusions of a milder herb."[26]

This is pure, unalloyed Cowper. He simply could not bring himself to say an unpleasant word about women. But it is also in part the expression of the conventional Eighteenth Century attitude. Swift, Chesterfield, Dr. Johnson, and a host of others, agreed with him in calling women "the sex whose presence civilizes ours,"[27] though some were less enthusiastic than he about feminine wit, intelligence, and virtue. Cowper had been especially fortunate in the companionship of Mrs. Unwin and Lady Austen.

Lines 269-276 paint a mystifying picture:

> "The emphatic speaker dearly loves to oppose
> In contact inconvenient, nose to nose,
> As if the gnomon on his neighbor's phiz,
> Touch'd with a magnet, had attracted his.
> His whisper'd theme, dilated and at large,
> Proves after all a wind-gun's airy charge,—
> An abstract from his diary—no more.
> A tasteless journal of the day before."

Here is an emphatic speaker who rubs noses and whispers. Of course emphasis and shouting are not inseparable companions; but emphasis and whispering are strange twins. Cowper is probably con-

[26] Ll. 265-268.

[27] See Swift's *Hints*: "This degeneracy of conversation, . . . has been owing, among other causes, to the custom arisen, for some time past, of excluding women from any share in our society." Cf. Chesterfield: "Now . . . I would recommend to you, to go into women's company . . . , for it certainly polishes the manners." Letter XXIV, p. 42. Dr. Johnson said, "There are ten genteel women to one genteel man, because they are more restrained." Boswell's *Life*, p. 305.

fused. If so, why? The answer is to be found by comparing these lines with several sentences in No. 138 of the *Connoisseur*. In that essay he had said,

> "We may consider the professed speakers. And first, the emphatical; who squeeze, and press, and ram down every syllable with excessive vehemence and energy . . . . They should be suffered only to syringe, as it were, the ears of a deaf man, through a hearing-trumpet; though I must confess, that I am equally offended with whisperers and low speakers, who seem to fancy all their acquaintance deaf, and come up so close to you, that they may be said to measure noses with you."

In "Conversation" these two images, once distinct and separate, have blended. The final portrait is therefore inaccurate, and based on two types sketched in London twenty-five years before.

A person who uses perfume is, if anything, more offensive than an emphatic one; the former only irritates, but the latter makes the poet sick and anxious "to maul the thing."[28] "A graver coxcomb . . .,

> "Quite as absurd, though not so light, as he," is the man with
> "A shallow brain behind a serious mask."
> . . . . . .
> "An oracle within an empty cask,
> . . . . . .
> He says but little, and that little said
> Owes all its weight, like loaded dice, to lead."[29]

Cowper may be indebted to Swift for this portrait.[30] He probably had "Hints Toward an Essay on Conversation" in mind, too, when he came to write of the person who talks about his diseases. But for the latter picture he had also a living model in Olney. Writing to the Rev. John Newton on December 31, 1781, he says,

> "A visitor who is more tedious than entertaining has rather disconcerted me, and exhausted my spirits. 'Your humble servant, Sir . . . I hope I see you well . . . I thank you, Madam, but indifferent. I have had a violent colic, which providentially took a turn downward, or I think I must have died. Seven or

[28] Ll. 283-294. This "puss-gentleman" is also evidently a reminiscence from his London days. He had sketched a similar person in No. 111 of the *Connoisseur*, calling him "the delicate Billy Suckling."

[29] Ll. 295-310 give the complete description.

[30] See "Hints."

eight times in a night, Madam. My neighbor Bannister has the same disorder, and is remarkably costive, so that I verily fear for his life. Yes truly, I think the poor man cannot get over it.' This is a small specimen—how should you like the whole? I can find you a sheet full of the like whenever you please, taken faithfully from his lips."[31]

The fact that the visitor (probably Samuel Teedon) is thus pilloried after "Conversation" was written need not disturb us. The last two sentences certainly imply that Cowper had had many similar experiences. He may have come directly from a previous one to write the lines of the poem:

> "Some men employ their health, an ugly trick,
> In making known how oft they have been sick,
> And give us, in recitals of disease,
> A doctor's trouble, but without the fees;
> . . . . . .
> They thought they must have died, they were so bad;
> Their peevish hearers almost wish they had."[32]

After a brief tilt at the fretful person, who is never pleased no matter what one does for him, Cowper comes to a subject that to him had always been important—bashfulness. He himself had been troubled with it since childhood. During his youthful sojourn in London, when he was trying valiantly to overcome it, he had assumed a scornful attitude toward all those similarly afflicted. In his *Connoisseur* essay, "On Conversation," he listed among the worst conversational pests "the silent men, who seem afraid of opening their mouths lest they should catch cold, and literally observe the precept of the gospel, by letting their conversation be only yea, yea, and nay, nay." This attitude, however, changed with the years, until in "Conversation" he says,

> "I pity bashful men, who feel the pain
> Of fancied scorn and undeserved disdain,
> And bear the marks, upon a blushing face,
> Of needless shame and self-imposed disgrace.

[31] Cowper's *Correspondence*, I, 419.

[32] Ll. 311-324. This attitude is un-Christian, but few will doubt its essential justice.

Our sensibilities are so acute,
The fear of being silent makes us mute."[33]

With discernment born of bitter personal experience, he analyzes the causes for this embarrassment. First, Britons, as a race, are undemonstrative and seem to fear each other. Second, vanity may make one think so highly of his own attainments that he

". . . dare not risk them into public view,
Lest they miscarry of what seems their due."

Cowper ends the "jocular" part of the poem with a savage attack upon the fox hunter. Even the hunter's grooms despise him, as do his horses. Only his friends at the club will welcome him to their "scene of savage joys," and there

"Let him improve his talent if he can,
Till none but beasts acknowledge him a man."[34]

In summary, then, the village, like London, has people who talk about trivial things, discuss obscene topics, curse and swear, argue simply for the sake of argument, tell long stories, lie, drive women away by smoking and drinking, talk loudly, whisper, talk gravely of foolishness, recite the course of their diseases, and make fools of themselves through bashfulness. In addition some villagers are hesitant and doubtful, some fretful, and some so wrapped up in hunting that their society is obnoxious.

Except for a general statement at the beginning and some comments on obscenity and swearing, Cowper, as has been noted, soft-pedals the religious note in the "jocular" part of "Conversation." He comes down on the loud pedal with both feet in the remainder. God, he states, granted to man the gift of speech. Why? Manifestly in order that he might sing His praises. The mind

"Should range where Providence has bless'd the soil,"

gathering evidence of divine favors,

"That good diffused may more abundant grow,
And speech may praise the Power that bids it flow."[35]

With this as an introduction, Cowper plunges on, scattering fire and brimstone in all directions. Whereas Chesterfield, the worldly-

[33] Ll. 347-352. This passage continues through line 404.
[34] This topic is treated in Ll. 405-426.
[35] See Ll. 427-456.

wise, had analyzed the ways of men and contrived a system to beat them at their own game, Cowper, the unworldly, damns the ways of man and includes in his condemnation anyone who tries to play the game at all. For instance, Chesterfield advised his son to make his manners conform to the prevailing customs wherever he happened to be. Cowper, probably with that in mind, rails at Fashion and brands as a fool anyone who follows her:

> "The fruitful parent of abuse and wrong,
> Holds a usurp'd dominion o'er his tongue;
> There sits and prompts him with his own disgrace,
> Prescribes the theme, the tone, and the grimace,
> And, when accomplish'd in her wayward school,
> Calls gentleman whom she has made a fool."

The chief sin of Fashion is that she will not allow religion to be mentioned in general conversation.

> " 'Tis an unalterable fix'd decree
> That none could frame or ratify but she,
> That heaven and hell, and righteousness and sin,
> Snares in his path, and foes that lurk within,
> God and his attributes (a field of day
> Where 'tis an angel's happiness to stray),
> Fruits of his love and wonders of his might,
> Be never named in ears esteem'd polite."[36]

If, as seems probable, Cowper was here deriding Chesterfield's advice to his son in Letter XXXVIII,[37] he has missed the point. Chesterfield calls it unwise to talk about religion in company because shallow wits immediately fall upon the church and her priests with laughter and derision. But Cowper was never the man to weigh motives when a cherished idea was challenged, and the place of religion in conversation was the theme of his whole poem. The entire second half of the piece is given over to elaborating it.

Cowper's argument is this: Our life on earth is a passage through a vale of tears; if we try to enjoy the fleeting moment and laugh at the future, we are fools; true happiness can only come through contemplation of the bliss to come after death; therefore conversation, to be truly valuable and in the deepest sense pleasant, must

[36] Ll. 457-474 include this passage.
[37] Vol. I, p. 71.

be concerned with religion. It should be like that of the two disciples who talked with the resurrected Christ on the way to Emmaus,[38] confirming wavering faith and healing spiritual wounds.

Two objections, he admits, may be urged: first, that such conversation will be too serious, and second, that it may be fanatical. Those who bring forward the first point he brands forthwith as ignorant.

> "Is sparkling wit the world's exclusive right,
> The fix'd fee-simple of the vain and light?"[39]

he asks; and answers, No. The true Christian is witty, but in a different way.

> "A Christian's wit is inoffensive light,
> A beam that aids, but never grieves the sight,"[40]

more restrained, doubtless, than that of the trifler, but for that very reason better. As to the second point, the fanatic is not a true Christian. Fanaticism,

> ". . . . . when soberly defined,
> Is the false fire of an o'erheated mind."[41]

The truly religious talker, like any good talker, is truthful and sincere. There is, then, a happy medium between too much gravity and too much gaiety, between fanaticism and worldliness.

> "To find the medium asks some share of wit,
> And therefore 'tis a mark fools never hit.
> But though life's valley be a vale of tears,
> A brighter scene beyond the vale appears,
> Whose glory, with a light that never fades,
> Shoots between scatter'd rocks and opening shades;
> And, while it shows the land the soul desires,
> The language of the land she seeks inspires,
> Thus touch'd, the tongue receives a sacred cure
> Of all that was absurd, profane, impure;
> Held within modest bounds, the tide of speech
> Pursues the course that Truth and Nature teach;
> No longer labours merely to produce

[38] Luke 24: 13-32. Cowper's Ll. 505-546.
[39] Ll. 589, 590.
[40] Ll. 599, 600.
[41] Ll. 667, 668.

The pomp of sound, or tinkle without use:
Where'er it winds, the salutary stream,
Sprightly and fresh, enriches every theme;
While all the happy man possess'd before,
The gift of nature, or the classic store,
Is made subservient to the grand design,
For which Heaven form'd the faculty divine."[42]

There, in his final summary, is the gist of Cowper's whole poem, a summary anticipated and reinforced by a picture of the ideal talker a few lines before. That picture[43] fits none of Cowper's acquaintances so well as it does the Rev. John Newton.

Many of us will find Cowper's theme distasteful, and think the Rev. John Newton (with some injustice, if the comments of other persons who knew him are reliable) a stiff-necked prig. We may believe that conversation is a method of getting what we want from somebody else (See any modern book on salesmanship), or that it is an art concerned with entertainment and instruction (See J. B. Priestley's *Talking*). Then we are followers, respectively, of Chesterfield or Swift. The important thing is that in the Eighteenth Century all three points of view were adequately presented. Perhaps Chesterfield was more thorough than Cowper, Swift more intelligent. But surely neither was more sincere. And for the student of conversational theory the religious recluse is as significant as the polished noble or the brilliant wit.

THAT WHITE HEADED BOY—NEUROLOGY

MILDRED FREBURG BERRY
Rockford College

IN THE minds of many, neurology has become an increasingly obnoxious relative of that neo-science, psychology. From recent articles in psychological journals, I catch a feeling of resentment, and ofttimes, of open rebellion against the application of neurological findings to psychology. Neurology has been 'dubbed' by them "the

[42] LI., 879–898.

[43] The Rev. John Newton had left Olney for London about seven years before this was written. Cowper saw him only at rare intervals thereafter.

great illusion," "the supernatural riddle," the "white headed boy." They complain that the neurologist gives them no help in their battle with the knotty problems of mind and consciousness and personality. They would cast out this science because it can only explain, they say, a small part of the mind,—the anatomy and function of the nervous system. It is here that I must part company with the dissenters. Do they mean that because the brain and spinal cord and peripheral nerves are but a phase of that which they call "mind" that they are not the proper study of a psychologist? Is it true that we always study the intergrated whole, never its parts?

In our own field of Speech, we speak glibly these days of muscular contraction and tonus, of total bodily response and co-ordinated activity. Yet it is true that we do not have a complete knowledge of the physiology of the body. As a matter of fact, we are still somewhat hazy, I understand, as to the chemistry of muscular contraction. That does not deter us, however, from using what we know about muscular contraction in the study of posture, and to look hopefully to the day when the physiologist will deal out to us more complete information.

I grant that the premises of neurology are not 'self-evident truths'; they are complex indeed. But in my brief acquaintance with physics, biology, and chemistry, I have found 'the givens' far removed from sight; yet scholars in speech have shown no reluctance in borrowing from them. I also would agree with those who say that a science built on mysteries cannot be safely used by the teacher of an art subject. But I do not know such a science, unless it be the fakirs' phrenology or "faith healing,"—self-styled sciences. It was my idea that the very aim of science was to abolish mystery, to seek the truth, to bring order out of a chaotic universe. It was a neurologist who shattered the mystical philosopher's concept that the pineal gland was the seat of the soul. Mr. C. Judson Herrick, the world-famous neurologist, speaks not mysteriously, but quite plainly when he declares that "mental processes are biological functions of the body in general and of the brain in particular in just the same sense that circulation of the blood is a function of the heart or breathing is a function of the lungs. The evidence for this is biological evidence. It is the same kind of evidence in each of the three cases, and it is equally clear and convincing. A great many people refuse to believe this; but most people do not know as much about

brains as they do about heart and lungs. Even psychologists often have very hazy notions of what the brain is and how it works. We are all inclined to neglect or slur over what we don't know, on the principle, I suppose, that what you don't know won't hurt you. But if you do not know that a diet deficient in vitamines will give you rickets or scurvy, that may hurt you. And if the psychologist does not know that brains think, his science may be rickety too."[1] There is nothing that savours of the occult in such a statement. It impresses me as rather plain common sense. Nor was there anything very mysterious in the fundamental laws of the conditioned reflex which Pavlov, the physiologist and neurologist, established, or in the irreversibility of nerve conduction, or in the principles of summation, reinforcement, and inhibition, or in Sherrington's "final common path." These are fundamental tenets of one corner of the field of neurology.

I can also agree heartily with those who say that much of neurology mystifies the casual student of the science. Three weeks ago, the cortico-ponto-cerebellar-rubro-spinal system was a great Chinese puzzle to my way of thinking. Today it is much more of a reality and by tomorrow I have hope of understanding some of the possibilities of that marvelous combination of pathways. It is true that we may not know all the possibilities of a nerve tract, but neither do we understand all the ramifications of the electron theory, or gravitation, or life. I confess, too, that I do not understand, for example, the exact transformation of a stimulus into an electro-chemical wave of negativity, but I am willing to take Dr. A. V. Hill's word for it because he is a physicist and a chemist, and I am more or less a tyro in these matters. Certainly I could never raise my voice in a cry of 'witchcraft' over all the things in neurology which baffle me. Humility and the spirit of seeking, not vigorous abnegation, would seem to be a much more fitting attitude for the scientific approach to an unfamiliar field of knowledge.

The neurologist has taken quite a different stand toward the psychologist. I find one of their number attempting to unify the divergent schools of psychology in these words: "If mind as we know it phenomenally, that is, as an awareness process, is not knit into the sequence of living as a natural event, if mind is epiphenome-

[1] Herrick, C. Judson: *The Thinking Machine.*

non, parallel phenomenon, by-product, or any other sort of pseudo-phenomenon and not a natural process integrated with the rest of living as a unitary sequence approachable with the ordinary technique of natural science, then introspective psychology can have no possible use for any of the lumber of the objective sciences. Nor on this supposition, can any experience examined only introspectively have any place in natural science. On the other hand, if that experience which we objectify and that experience which we do not objectify are alike organic parts of the natural process of orderly living, then we have found a common ground on which introspective psychology and objective psychology can work together in peace and harmony and with mutual advantage."[2]

But to return to my original purpose, namely, to set down a few ways in which the science of neurology may be of great help to the teacher of psychology, yes, even to the teacher of psychology of speech. It may always be argued that such knowledge can be of no practical use in teaching speech. Quite true, it may not be. Nerves and ganglia, and nuclei and commissures and decussations may have no significance if memorized as such, or they may take on great significance when we learn of the function, for example, of the medial leminiscus, or the longitudinal fasciculus, or the corpus callosum. To the unimaginative, to the non-creative, yes, they may be always only names, but the fault lies not with the subject, but with us, dear Brutus—with our cortical and spinal tracts.

The field of general psychology still is looking for gifts from Neurology. For a number of years the problem of sex differences has baffled the psychologist. The neurologist has not solved it for us as yet. But what he has done is to prove the presence of structural differences in the nervous system. In doing this he is far closer to rock bottom than the psychologist who compiles statistics of sex differences in handedness or in motor skill, or in emotional stability on the basis of a partially subjective battery of tests.

Messrs. Kinichi Ide and Hiro Ide of the Wistar Institute of Anatomy and Biology have done a most exacting piece of work on the measurement of the size of certain nerve fibers of rats. They found that there was a true sex difference in the actual size of the

[2] Herrick, C. Judson: *Brains of Rats and Men;* University of Chicago Press. 1926. p. 352.

fibers composing the nerves, showing at the same time, that "the difference is due to an increase in the areas of the constituent fibers," not to myelination.[3] In another series of experiments, carried out by Gü Ngowyang in the Biological Laboratory of the Science Society of China, it was found that "the diameters of the nuclei of the cells at every level in the female are larger than those at the corresponding levels in the male."[4] Later, similar measurements were made on human beings. Mr. Ide summarizes the results: "The most significant differences here observed are in the areas of the fibers. The area of the largest fibers is larger in negroes than in whites and larger in females than in males in each race. . . . The growth in the sectional area of the nerves according to sex is, in man, even more marked than the observations on the rat would lead us to expect."[5] Accepting Herrick's statement as true that "in general, highly developed muscle fibers, sense organs, etc. receive larger nerve fibers than similar organs in a state of structural degradation," then it is possible to suggest that the difference in size of nerve fibers partially may explain the superior abilities of women in basic motor coordination, facility of speech, etc.[6] A larger nerve fiber would mean a shorter refractory period and a lower chronaxie.[7] Nerve cells of great size would aid the storage of nutritive material. In other words, the sex difference in rapidity of coordination and motor disabilities partially may be found to lie in structural differences in the nervous system. Such a finding should give support to some of the investigators in the field of psychology.

Another problem on which psychologists have been experimenting for years is that of tactile discrimination. I recall from my course in Psychology of Learning that experiments in training individuals to increase their ability in determining the location of two

[3] Ide, Kinichi: "Size of Nerve Fibers According to Sex;" *Journal of Comparative Neurology;* June 1930. p. 150. vol. 50; no. 1.

[4] Ngowyang, Gü: "On the Growth of Motor Cells from Birth to Maturity"; *Journal of Comparative Neurology;* vol. 50; no. 1. p. 244.

[5] Ide, Kinichi: "Size of Nerve Fibers According to Sex." *Journal of Comparative Neurology;* December, 1930. vol. 51; no. 2. pp. 520–21.

[6] Herrick, C. Judson: "A Note on the Significance of Size of Nerve Fibers in Fishes": *Jour. Comp. Neurology;* vol. 12; no. 4, 1902.

[7] Heinbecker, Peter: "Effect on Anoexemia, Carbon Dioxide, and Lactic Acid, on Electrical Phenomena of Myelinated Fibers of the Peripheral Nervous System." *American Journal of Physiology;* 89: 58–81.

compass points on the skin had been unsuccessful. The explanation was offered that the possible range of improvement was so narrow as to make measurement difficult. Various workers in the pathology of speech have suggested that one of the best tests to determine the integrity of sensibility of the tongue is to use the reaction to tactile discrimination. Dr. Ranson in the *Anatomy of the Nervous System*[8] and Dr. Herrick in *Introduction to Neurology*[9] state that the fibers for tactile discrimination, few in number and widely diffuse, follow a different course from the tracts for general exteroceptive sensibility. In the first place they do not synapse with cells in the posterior gray column of the cord as do those fibers of touch and pressure and pain and temperature. They turn into the posterior funiculus of the cord and must run the entire length to the medulla, before they make connections with the second neurons in this path in the gracile or cuneate nuclei. These nuclear areas are made up principally of cells on the spinal proprioceptive path to the cortex. They also were allowed but a corner in the posterior funiculus of the cord as they ascended to the medulla,—this funiculus being chiefly occupied by the conscious proprioceptive path. In suggesting the possible answer to the question on a structural basis, has not the neurologist brought us one step closer to the ultimate solution of this problem?

But I hear the opponents of this neurological psychology say: "But we see in this very little contribution to the special field of speech." True enough. Let us start from some principle which is certain to be in every speech teacher's vocabulary: "total bodily action." Now it may not be of any immediately practical value to know that this maxim has an embryological and neurological basis which is essentially sound, but I find the information somewhat fascinating and it makes me much more certain of the ultimate truth of this behavioristic principle. G. E. Coghill in a series of lectures delivered at University College, London, in 1929 on "Anatomy and the Problem of Behavior" makes some pertinent observations on this point. He studied the embryologic and post-foetal development of a great number of vertebrates, particularly the amblystoma. The first

[8] Ranson, S. W.: *The Anatomy of the Nervous System;* W. B. Saunders Co. Third edition, 1930.

[9] Herrick, C. J.: *Introduction to Neurology;* W. B. Saunders Co. Philadelphia, 1927. Fourth edition, 1927.

movement to be noted in the amblystoma is a generalized cephalocaudal progression of muscular contraction. Then "a day or two ordinarily elapses between the time when the arm begins to move with the action of the trunk before it acquires the ability to respond to a local stimulus without the perceptible action of the trunk. Such independence of limb action appears to be acquired by a gradual reduction in the action of the trunk. At any rate, movement of the limb has been frequently observed to occur with slight movement of the head just before limb movement without perceptible trunk movement made its appearance. It is obvious, therefore, that the first limb movement is an integral part of the total reaction of the animal, and that it is only later that the limb acquires an individuality of its own in behavior. The local reflex of the arm is not a primary or elementary behavior pattern of the limb. It is secondary, and derived from the total pattern by a process of individuation."[10] The fish like the human being must act "toute d'une piece." On the basis of the same principle we have objected to posture and gestures or movements which seemed to be out of harmony with one another. Dr. Coghill writes of the amblystoma: "First the earliest near approach to discrete limb movement appears as a postural reaction; and second, postural response sensitizes the exteroceptive reflex mechanism. In other words, the limb is able to respond very precisely to stimuli arising within the body (proprioceptive) as the result of a particular posture before it can respond to stimuli that arise exclusively from the outside world (exteroceptive); and this postural reaction of the limb enables it to respond to stimuli from the outside world before it can otherwise do so excepting as the trunk response to the same stimulation. In this primitive vertebrate, therefore, the local reflex of the limb of the normal animal is primarily allied with posture. It is intricately involved from the very beginning with the behavior pattern of the entire animal . . . . In our explanation of the nature of the movements of the trunk it was explained that nerve cells are arranged in a longitudinal series in the spinal cord in such a way that they conduct excitations from the head tailward, and that from these nerve cells side branches go to the muscle segments to excite them to contraction. But these side

[10] Coghill, G. E.: *Anatomy and the Problem of Behavior;* The Macmillan Co., New York, 1929. pp. 18–19.

branches, as motor nerves, do not stop growing when they reach the muscle segments. Having attached themselves to the muscle segment and established their control over it, they, by other branches, grow on beneath and beyond the muscle segment and invade the territory of the limb. The first motor nerve fibers to reach the muscles of the limb are, therefore, branches of the same nerve fibers that stimulate the trunk muscles to action. Furthermore, these nerves reach into the territory of the limb-muscles long before muscle tissue is formed. As a result of this precocious invasion of limb-forming by branches of nerve cells that are already integrating the trunk, the earliest movements of the limbs are of necessity totally integrated with trunk action. The central government, so to speak, establishes its sovereignty over the rising community before that community has acquired a central organization of its own, and subsequently grants to its subjects more or less autonomy as time goes on." This means, concludes Dr. Coghill,[11] that local reflexes emerge as, in the language of gestalt a 'quality upon a ground'; that is to say, they emerge as a special feature within a more diffuse but dominant mechanism of integration of the whole organism. They cannot be regarded as simply the action of a chain of neurones, excepting every link of the chain is conceived to be welded into the organism as a whole. This principle is thoroughly demonstrated for amblystoma, a typical vertebrate, and there is nothing in our knowledge of the development of behavior to indicate that the principle does not prevail universally in vertebrates including man. There is no direct evidence for the hypothesis that behavior, in so far as the form of the pattern is concerned, is simply a combination or coordination of reflexes. On the contrary, there is conclusive evidence of a dominant organic unity from the beginning. That evidence appears not only in the manner in which behavior develops, but particularly in the manner in which the nervous system puts the principle into effect, for, as shown in the first lecture, the nervous system concerns itself first with the maintenance of the integrity of the individual, and only later makes provision for local reflexes."[12]

It is an organic unity on a wholesale plan that is distributed in sufferers from stagefright. The coordinating centers in the central

[11] Coghill, G. E.; *Ibid.* pp. 21–22.
[12] Coghill, G. E. *Ibid*, p. 89.

nervous system as well as peripheral innervation are out of gear. Sir Charles Sherrington states that subtetanic contraction is, of course, tremulous. Such "a tremulous contraction must threaten the steadiness of the whole muscle. But lessening such defect is the circumstance that the various subtetanized units are out of phase with one another. It may well be a specific office of coordination to keep them out of phase. If a number of the subtetanic units once get into step with each other, tremor must become gross. Clonus, Denny-Brown says, is the tonic asynchronous discharge of the units thrown into synchronism."[13] Such an explanation seems reasonable indeed to those of us who have tried to control our oscillating knees before an all too-observing audience. But some one objects that the statement, lucid as it may be, will never cure one's malady of stage fright. Perhaps not, but it brings me a little closer to the final "why" of the problem.

The teacher's most frequent advice to such a student is to initiate voluntary action. Mr. Woolbert in *Fundamentals of Speech* advises the beginning speaker in this way: "Here is a simple relief for initial stage fright, for that first devastating moment when you face the 'sea of upturned faces': Merely find some easy, comfortable everyday things for the hands to do. It seems strange, but it can be demonstrated over and over again that when your hands are occupied with simple, everyday tasks, you cannot harbor much embarrassment or stage fright. Pick up a book and glance at its title, run through the pages, turn it over, caress it—all simply and comfortably—and you will feel at ease if you can keep yourself occupied."[14] Is this not simply keeping the units out of phase with one another by purposive action?

In much the same way is the suggestion "to breath deeply" a device to regain coordination in the body. Breathing, embryologically considered, is an integral part of the entire somatic response. Coghill states the idea very precisely: "The muscles of the external gills are therefore subjected to excitation not only by those afferent impulses which are on the way to the way to the motor mechan-

[13] Sherrington, Sir Charles: "Hughlings Jackson Lecture on Quantitative Management of Contraction for Lower Level Coordination"; *British Medical Journal;* Feb. 7, 1931. pp. 207–11.

[14] Woolbert, C. H.: *The Fundamentals of Speech;* Harper Brothers, New York 1927, p. 87.

ism of the trunk, but also by those efferent impulses of the motor path which are on the way directly to the muscles of the trunk. In general, therefore, by reason of these relations of the motor neurones that innervate the muscles of the gills, these muscles, after they have acquired sensitiveness to nervous excitation, would be expected to receive excitation from impulses that are on the way to the muscles of the trunk."[15] It is only reasonable to assume that restoration of a part of the mechanism which has gone awry will also oppose more widespread bodily coordination. Adrian and Bronk demonstrated Sherrington's thesis in their work on the phrenic nerve of the rabbit. They found "that the changes in force of contraction of the diaphragm appear to depend mainly on this change in the frequency of the motor impulses; at the lower frequencies the contraction of each group of muscle fibers is in an incomplete tetanus, but the diaphragm contracts smoothly because the discharges in the different nerve fibers are not synchronous."[16]

We have heard much recently of the process of conditioning in speech. At first thought, conditioning may appear as a violation of total unity, an arbitrary selection of facilitating paths. On second thought, it appears to be a specific part of the general effort of the body to operate as a whole. It represents the organic unity of the nervous system. There is no mysterious Psyche ruling over the connections to be made in response to stimuli. Dendrites of nerve cells continue to grow up to and beyond maturity, perhaps to the age of thirty. Intense excitation of the simple neural arcs laid down before birth overflows into other channels. Neighboring nerve cells whose dendrites are growing out toward a lower physiological gradient receive the electro-chemical wave of over-flow of activity. It is a simple unified process. Coghill says, "In the conditioning mechanism in general, as in the case of the Rohon-Beard cell, according to this hypothesis, laws of growth determine the structural relation of conductors, but their specific sensitivity is fixed by the mode of excitation . . . . The nerve cell must be thought of, not simply as a conductor, but also as an element in a system of preneural forces that are constantly reacting upon one another. Its reaction

[15] Coghill, G. E.: *Ibid*, pp. 32–33.

[16] Adrian, E. D., and Bronk, D. W.: "The discharges of impulses in motor nerve fibers." *Jour. Physiology* 66: 81–101. 1928.

to its environment through its inherent potentiality of growth must play a part in the conditioning of hebavior in the mammals as does similar reaction of the primitive association cell in the Amblystoma. One phase of this activity must be the development constantly of new specifications of sensitivity through growing dendritic terminals in relation to the different modes of stimulation. It may, indeed, be that such a progressive differentiation of sensitivity essentially constitutes the conditioning process."[17] But Coghill would not have you misunderstand the possibilities of the conditioning process. He repeats, in closing his series of lectures: "Man is, indeed, a mechanism, but he is a mechanism which, within his limitations of life, sensitivity and growth, is creating and operating himself."[18] In this creation and operation he must proceed as an organic unity if he is to be a going concern.

Inextricably bound up with total bodily action is the subject of emotion and emotional stability. That emotion was largely non-cortical in nature we have long recognized. Present day neurologists are inclined to believe that the correlation center lies in the thalamus. Such a belief is founded upon certain facts of structure. The thalamus is the highest non-cortical center in the brain. It is also the great way station through which all exteroceptive and cortical proprioceptive impulses must pass on their way to the brain. Impulses of touch and pressure, pain and temperature, vision, audition, olfaction, conscious orientation in space,—all synapse with cells in the lateral nucleus of the thalamus or in the metathalamus. To make this possible, the thalamus in mammals has grown from a group of two nuclear masses for olfaction to a relatively tremendous size and complexity. If our feelings, yes, even our personality is the product of our responses to our environment, then it is quite logical to assume that that which we call personality may reside in part, in the diencephalon. Herrick in *Brains of Rats and Men* puts it this way: "The thalamus is a true correlation center in the sense that it is not dominated by any single system of sensory excitations. In none of these lower vertebrates is it very large or very complex in internal structure. In terms of the physiological conceptions which we have already developed most of the behavior of these animals is evidently controlled in the

[17] Coghill, G. E.: ibid., pp. 104-105.
[18] Coghill, G. E.: ibid., p. 110.

primary sensory centers with the aid of their connecting fiber tracts and the proprioceptive adjustments of the cerebellum. But when problems of conduct arise for which simply organized apparatus is inadequate the nervous excitations overflow into the thalamus, and here the reflex elements may be recombined in new patterns. . . Further attention should be directed to its peculiar function as a center of integration for all those processes that cooperate in the fabrication and maintenance of those enduring attitudes and reaction types which give to the individual his own peculiar character and personality and perhaps his feeling of personal identity. These are doubtless partly innate and partly acquired patterns of synthesis of exteroceptive, proprioceptive, and visceral experience, superposed upon the lower reflex mechanisms but for the most part not intelligently fabricated. The organization of these 'intimate senses' into the stable patterns which we call 'personality' is at a very low level in forms below the mammals (so far as we know) ; but within the mammals there is progressive increase in the size and structural complexity of the between brain and parallel with this an elaboration of its intrinsic functions in several directions. There is, first, a more closely knit assembling of all those internal processes, both inborn and acquired, which give the organism its sense of well being or malaise, its awareness of personal identity, and its distinctive disposition and character. Animals at least as low in the scale as dogs show very marked individual differences in these respects, as everyone who has kept dogs knows very well. There are also certain specific thalamic reflexes and the discharge of thalamic activities upward into the cerebral cortex. Finally, the thalamic functions are under cortical control through an extensive system of fibers from cortex to thalamus."[19] Students of the fundamentals of speech are instructed to be direct, "to look the auditor in the eye," to show a facial expression that is typical of the ideas and feelings to be communicated. Through the fiber systems emanating from the thalamus, correlation is affected between the centers of emotion and the expression of that emotion. Not only are the facial muscles played upon by these efferent tracts from the thalamus, but, by means of the medial longitudinal fasciculus, the eyes also react to impulses from the thalamus. Emil Villiger, after tracing these pathways very carefully concludes: "Certainly, experimental investigations and clinical

[19] Herrick, C. J.: *Brains of Rats and Men*; ibid., pp. 134-5, p. 147.

observation all indicate that the thalami must be regarded as reflex centers for the expressive, affective and mimic movements, and that they are probably also important centers for the reflex activities of the internal organs. The transmission of impulses leading to movements of expression probably follows the above-mentioned fiber system (thalamo-fugal) which extends caudally from the thalamus to the nucleus rubro, and thence as the rubro-reticular and rubro-spinal tracts. The fibre system gives off collaterals to the motor nuclei of the cranial nerves, among these to the facial nuclei, from which proceed the motor fibres for the innervation of the mimic facial musclatures. The connection of this fibre-system with guadrigeminal midbrain region and the system of the posterior commissure and of the medial longitudinal fasciculus, and the relations, thereby given, to the nuclei of the eye muscles nerves, may well afford the anatomical basis for the part the eye muscles play in the movements of expression."[20] Moreover, these pathways are not only homolateral, but they are also contralateral in course. The pathway on each side of the body innervates the same side in which it runs, but it also sends collaterals over to the corresponding nuclei on the other side. Thus unity of expression is guaranteed. According to Villiger, this bilateral innervation "holds true for those motor cranial nerve nuclei (and muscles innervated by them) which, as a rule function in bilateral symmetrical fashion, as for example the muscles innervated by the superior branch of the facial nerve, and the masticatory pharyngeal and laryngeal musculature."[21]

In general psychology as well as in the particular field of psychology of speech, we have been much concerned about the training of expressional control. Has not the neurologist pointed out some of the causes of our difficulties?

It has been pointed out by Sapir, O'Neill and Weaver, and others that speech is an overlaid function. "Speech comes not from the use of special muscle systems, with which we have been endowed primarily for the purpose of enabling us to speak, but rather from the specialized use of muscles which have other more fundamental biological functions."[22]

[20] Villiger, Emil: *Brain and Spinal Cord;* J. B. Lippincott Co. Edited by Addison, Third rev. Amer. edition, 1925, p. 233.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 227.

[22] O'Neill, James M. and Weaver, Andrew T.: *The Elements of Speech*; Longmans, Green and Co., 1921, p. 33.

Now it would seem to me that not only is speech an overlaid mechanism from the functional aspect but that it also is overlaid from a structural point of view. The muscles of the larynx and pharynx from a developmental standpoint are visceral, yet they have become somatic in function. "Most of the gill muscles of fishes have disappeared in the human body; but some survive in the pharynx and larynx with all greatly changed functions, and these muscles in man are innervated from the visceral motor column as in fishes, even though their functions have been secondarily transformed to the somatic type."[23] It is possible that herein lies a double hazard for the speech mechanism. It is not only an overlaid function, but its muscular set-up has been taken over from a visceral structure.

I am puzzled by the statement of the psychologists that the neurologist describes memory as though this faculty reclined in the "dead ends in the brain." In my brief contact with neurology, I have received no impression of anything very dead about the cortex. As a matter of fact, all too much is often happening in every fiber tract for my feeble powers of comprehension. I have often wished that tracts would end, that impulses might be brought to a dead halt, but alas! these tracts seem to present infinite possibilities for connection. Coghill's picture is not one of stationary dendrites, but rather a concept of growing living protoplasm. "Man is more than the sum of his reflexes, instincts, and immediate reactions of all sorts. He is all these plus his creative potential for the future."[24] Herrick in *The Thinking Machine* must mean almost the same thing when he says, "the brain centers are knit in with bodily processes, including those of lower nervous centers, as going concerns. They will act when excited from these lower centers to facilitate and diversify the standardized behavior patterns, but they do not act "of themselves" and apart from what is going on in outlying parts . . . . The whole cortical apparatus is wound up and set on a trigger so that its latent reserves of motive power and memory patterns may be released by the slightest impulse set in motion by some external event or some change in the interior of the body. But this impulse must be 'adequate' physiologically, that is, it must be attuned to the cortical set

[23] Herrick, C. J.: *Neurological Foundations of Animal Behavior*, pp. 177-178.

[24] Coghill, G. E.: Ibid.

up which is to be activated."[25] In another connection he declares in summary: "This is the learning process. It is an active change in the internal organization or set of the neuromuscular apparatus. Now the retention is nothing other than the preservation, for longer or shorter time, of this change in the set of the apparatus. As long as this endures the memory is retained. No active process, either psychological or physiological, is involved. There is nothing about it more magical or esoteric than there is in winding an alarm clock at night in the assurance that when the hour-hand reaches six o'clock the spring will be released and the alarm which has been "set" will react in the way proper for all well-regulated alarm clocks."[26] It is thus written by a neurologist but it sounds strangely similar to the vernacular of the psychologist.

But some one may say, this does not agree with behavioristic psychology; this is the doctrine of Gestalt. With that I cannot agree, for Herrick almost uses the very sentences of certain behavioristic psychologists whom I know: "When we think the whole body thinks. We think all over just as a bird flies all over and just as we are alive all over. But as wings play a necessary and special part in flying, so brains are significant in a very special way in thinking. The cerebral cortex is the specific organ of thinking in quite the same sense as wings of birds are specific organs of flight or the legs of a man are specific organs of locomotion."[27] I grant that Dr. Herrick believes in the body and the mind as a mechanism, but his definition of mechanism is not the one in common parlance among psychologists. "With better understanding of the mechanisms of erosions, of species formation, of thinking, of desiring, and of aspiration, we see that all of these things are determiners in a unitary mechanistic cosmos. We have a conception of emergent evolution that has nothing mystical about it. We need no categories which are not related in cause-and-effect series with inorganic mechanisms to embrace all there is in life and in the man nature. The unity of the nature order remains unbroken. But we do need to recognize that the vital patterns of combination of simpler inorganic processes are different and that the conscious patterns are different from the unconscious. The con-

[25] Herrick, C. J.: *The Thinking Machine.* pp. 120-122.
[26] Herrick, C. J.: *Brains of Rat and Men.* p. 198.
[27] Herrick, C. J.: *The Thinking Machine,* pp. 249-50.

clusion is that the widespread hostility to the mechanistic conception of nature and of life is based on an inadequate view of what mechanism is. The fault lies not in the inadequacy of the mechanisms to do the work of nature and of mankind, but in too narrow a conception of mechanism in general."[28]

Neurology does not mystify; it clarifies. And if it can remove from the realm of the metaphysical some of the present hazy concepts of its off-spring, psychology, it would seem only wise for us to accept the gift thankfully. "What shall we do about it?" Dr. Herrick concludes: "Shall we resign ourselves to the inevitable and say, these mysteries are unknowable? . . . Why not approach the problem with the usual technique of scientific investigation, namely, to assemble all known observed facts that have a bearing on the question and then fabricate hypotheses that are congruous with the facts?"[29]

Again I return to my original spirit of inquiry. I do not understand why neurology should be the white-headed boy in the psychological family circle. In all that Dr. Herrick, Dr. Ranson, Sir Charles Sherrington, Emil Villiger, or Dr. Coghill have written about the nervous system, I find nothing abstract or metaphysical, or incongruous with the known order of things in psychology. Rather it seems to me to be remarkably concrete and tangible and worthwhile. I ask for a reassessment of the contributions of neurology to a struggling science, psychology.

QUESTIONS OF FACT vs. QUESTIONS OF POLICY

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF
University of Washington

DURING the debate season of 1930-31 most of the colleges belonging to the Pacific Forensic League debated two propositions of the kind known as questions of fact:

> Resolved that the expansion of the chain store is detrimental to the best interests of the American people.
>
> Resolved that Gandhi has been a benefit to India.

[28] Herrick, C. J.: *The Thinking Machine*, pp. 305-306.
[29] Herrick, C. J.: Ibid.

There questions or others like them have been widely used in school debating. In some of the recent volumes of the *University Debaters' Annual* questions of fact are used in almost half of the debates published, whereas up until three or four years ago they were used in only a fourth or fewer of the debates published in each issue of the *Annual*.

An editorial in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* for June, 1931, lists on page 407 sixteen recently used questions of the "Emotion has done more for the world than intellect" type; and suggests that they are really undebatable and frequently lead to "vaudeville performances" which prostitute debating ideals and bring debating into disrepute. The editorial makes no mention of questions of fact or policy, but it is interesting to note that fifteen of those sixteen trivial resolutions are in the form of questions of fact. This may be accidental; undoubtedly these propositions are not fair samples of the kind we are discussing. Yet one can scarcely help wondering whether the popularity of such propositions may not be connected somehow with the increasing tendency to use questions of fact.

Listening to and reading debates on many of the best available questions of fact has given rise to and prompted the expression of an opinion put down here for what it may be worth: *Debate coaches should insist that questions of policy instead of questions of fact be used in student debates.* This statement is not meant to apply to general argumentative speaking, nor to discussion, nor to extempore speaking. It refers only to the regular type of debate in which two teams oppose each other in affirming and denying in public argument the truth of an explicitly worded proposition.

Writers on debating and argumentation agree quite well on the nature of questions of policy. They are those propositions which declare that some person or agency shall do some particular thing or that such-and-such an action or policy should be carried out—e.g., "The United States should join the World Court." "John Jones should be elected president of the student body of W High School." When used in debate, such questions call for argument on a future course of activity or a change from some condition or situation now existing.

The nature of questions of fact is not quite so clear because they include more than one kind of proposition for debate. Most writers say that questions of fact are statements of alleged fact

which the arguers invite their audience to accept or reject as true. Such statements affirm or deny (1) the occurrence of events or actions, (2) the existence of things, (3) the classification of objects, or (4) the relationship of events or ideas. Babcock and Powell[1] name questions of opinion as a separate group and define them as questions "treating with the credibility of certain disputed conceptions"; e.g., A great merchant marine is necessary to the naval supremacy of the United States. Baird[2] puts in a separate class "propositions advocated as theoretically sound." Such propositions "consist of an affirmation or denial that an alleged policy is theoretically desirable," as for example, Resolved that the substitution of the judicial settlement of disputes in place of international war should be desirable. However, most writers seem to include these questions of opinion or of theoretical desirability in the class of questions of fact, and we are therefore including them as such in this discussion.

An examination of all the various definitions and illustrations of questions of fact shows that most of them have one or both of two significant characteristics: (1) They *imply* that some course of action should be followed. (2) They *seem* to be concerned with the facts or truth of a certain situation. Note one or two typical examples: "Resolved that the expansion of the chain store is detrimental." A debate on this resolution would clearly involve assertion and denial that the detrimental effect is a fact. And if it is a fact, we who are interested in the matter certainly ought to do something about it. Another example: "Resolved that intra-school athletics are more beneficial than inter-school athletics." This also clearly involves assertion and denial of a fact, which if true, implies that we should promote intra-school athletics rather than inter-school athletics.

The objections to questions of fact arise from these two general characteristics. We discuss first the implication that some course of action should be followed.

Insofar as questions of fact do imply a course of action, they are nothing more than awkwardly worded questions of policy, which for the sake of clarity and directness should be worded in terms of the particular course of action they suggest. If we mean to have a debater advocate or oppose the promotion of intra-school athletics in

[1] Babcock and Powell: *How to Debate;* Lippincott, 1923, pp. 9 and 10.
[2] Baird, A. Craig: *Public Discussion and Debate;* Ginn, 1928, p. 41.

general or in a particular school, why not say so in plain terms! Of course a very great difficulty arises because many questions of fact imply action in general but no one course of action in particular. A statement that chain stores are detrimental suggests no specific policy to be followed, although acceptance of the statement would probably lead a man to do his buying at independently owned stores. A resolution which proposes a specific course of action at least provides a definite starting point for the debate; the two sides are more likely to be talking about the same thing.

As Winans and Utterback[3] point out, the intention of the arguer rather than the form of statement of the resolution determines whether a question is one of fact or policy. This proposition—"The interests of the American people would be best served by the election of a Republican President"—is a question of policy, they say, if the arguer's purpose is to win votes for the Republican nominee. Now it is difficult to see why anyone would argue such a proposition seriously unless his real purpose were to win votes. For practical purposes the question would seem to be always a question of policy. Why clutter the resolution with such a vague term as "interests of the American people?" If the subject is to be debated,[4] and especially if it is to be debated by students, should not the question be so worded as to state clearly and directly the action desired? The following may suggest what we mean: "The members of this audience should vote for the Republican nominee for President."

In this connection it is interesting to note that many, if not most, of our student debates on questions of fact involve in some way a discussion of policy. This was true of practically every debate the writer listened to on the Chain Store and Gandhi questions mentioned at the beginning. The *University Debaters' Annual* provides further illustrations. In 1929-30 two universities debated, "Resolved that the United States cannot expect to have her debts paid until her tariff barriers are substantially reduced." The arguments favored and opposed the policy of lowering the tariff as an aid to the payment of our national debts. In another debate on the question, "Resolved that all matters of international dispute can be settled by arbitra-

[3] Winans and Utterback: *Argumentation;* Century, 1930, p. 32.

[4] It should be noted that, whereas this article is concerned with the more specialized viewpoint of debating, Winans and Utterback treat the matter from the viewpoint of argumentative speaking in general.

tion," the affirmative definitely proposed the policy of arbitration as a substitute for war, and the negative countered by advocating intervention. Other debates in years before 1929-30 showed the same tendency. An affirmative on the question, "Resolved that coeducation is a failure," argued that higher education for women should be pursued in segregated institutions. Arguments on the question, "Resolved that in the United States we are attempting to give too many people a college education," involved advocacy of some restriction of numbers by the affirmative and of equalized distribution of students by the negative. Such illustrations might be multiplied, but of course they prove little. However, they do suggest that perhaps the fundamental reason for debating such questions of fact is not just a desire to know the facts of a situation, but a deep concern about the courses of action or policies we should follow.

Now the question of fact which implies or suggests a policy confuses the inherent relation that exists between the facts of a situation and the policy or policies which might improve that situation.

Men seek knowledge chiefly because it is a necessary basis for choosing the courses of action that will solve the problems of living. Citizens are concerned about the adoption of a policy of arbitration or the enactment of a high or low tariff, and they consider the facts of present situations primarily to aid in determining future improvements in these matters. The statements that coeducation has failed or that too many people are in college, if their truth could be determined, would constitute only the starting points of the difficulties of educators; their basic concern is what to do. The present discussion is not concerned fundamentally with the goodness or badness (whatever those terms mean) of certain debate propositions; our basic concern is in the choice of propositions made by debaters. The significant value of the groups of facts associated with these matters is that they help us decide what to do.

There is nothing to debate about *facts* themselves, but there is plenty of occasion to debate about their relation to some method or methods of improving or some new policy of dealing with a situation. An argument that the tariff is too high, or an argument that too many people are in college, or that questions of fact are undesirable would be idle speculation if they were or could be separated from consideration of what to do to improve the situation. Is the speaker who debates a question of fact expected to prove that a given

situation does or does not exist? That is a matter for investigation, and may become a matter for discussion or expository speaking; but it is not a debatable matter, even though the statement of its existence might be necessary in a debate. Or is the speaker to prove that such a condition exists as to require a change in policy? If so, what change? Any change at all? In that case, the speakers on either side may discuss any kind of new policy that pleases them. Such a performance is not likely to involve the clash essential to a debate. But if speakers are to affirm and deny that a certain body of fact calls for the adoption of a given policy, then debate is in place. And the condition that either side may use only a portion of available fact in presenting its argument is only an incident of method and does not change the fundamental nature of the activity. Practical debating deals with the relation between the known facts of a situation and a given proposed course of action.

Yet the form of a question of fact implies that the facts of a situation are to be treated separately from any of the questions of policy to which they give rise and for the sake of which they are sought. The statement is always, "Resolved that a certain thing is true." Insofar as such a statement does suggest a policy, it does so vaguely and indirectly. Such a befuddling of the inherent relation between facts and policies is illogical and impractical. Facts are the necessary basis for determining policies, but the really vital concerns of debate are the policies themselves.

Hence, we say that a proposition for debate, which has the form of a question of fact, but which suggests or implies a policy, should be reworded as a proposition of policy, so that its form and intention may be in agreement. Otherwise there is not likely to be a clear and definite basis for the argument.

Of course, some questions of fact may not imply consideration of policies. This brings us to the second characteristic by which we defined questions of fact: They *seem* to be concerned with the facts or truth of a certain situation. We use the word "seem" not because there is any lack of questions that really ask, "What are the facts?" but because an attempt to deal with these questions by means of debate is futile. There are two reasons for this: First, most questions of fact which can be debated are necessarily and inevitably vague. Second, debating is not at all an instrument for determining facts. We shall consider these points in order.

First, most questions of fact which can be debated are necessarily and inevitably vague. This vagueness defies clear definition and frequently makes agreement on issues almost impossible. Consider the following typical questions of fact:

Resolved that a college education is an asset in business.

It is inadvisable for the United States to levy an income tax.

Education is the curse of the age.

Resolved that athletics in our high schools receive too much emphasis.

Resolved that the free text book system is desirable.

Just what is the meaning of the terms "asset in business," "inadvisable," "curse of the age," "too much emphasis," "desirable"? Ask the same question about the key words in propositions already quoted —"necessary," "detrimental," "beneficial," "interests of the American people," etc. By what standard should such words be defined? In a debate each side may easily take whatever definition suits its argument. Result—failure of the two sides to clash, or a wrangle over definitions! Perhaps a little of both! In either case, little, if any, real debating! Yet it is part of the very nature of debatable questions of fact to use such terms. If they were couched in specific terms, we should probably recognize them for what they really are—*matters calling for research.*

Of course questions of policy are often vague too, but their vagueness is not due to a confusion of purposes and methods of approach but rather to carelessness in wording or to indefiniteness of the policy proposed. The question, "Resolved that the United States should enforce the Monroe Doctrine," is vague because the Monroe Doctrine is complex and difficult to define. But debate on such a question becomes more and more valuable as the policy concerned is of a more and more specific nature; whereas a question of fact is made less debatable and brought more and more clearly into the field of research as it is made more specific.

This brings us to what is probably the greatest objection to debating questions of fact: The frequent assumption that such debating is a means of determining the facts of a given situation is a serious error. Debating is not at all an instrument for determining facts.

Of course, questions about facts are often discussed. Experts

in a field of knowledge may present the results of research to audiences, and may even deal with unsettled and controversial subjects. They may carry on discussion or argument with each other. A half dozen men, who separately have studied the causes for the wearing away of Niagara Falls, may meet to discuss the matter and find themselves in disagreement on various points. The discussion may clarify and define these differences. But when a point of difference is clearly understood, these six men, if they are sensible men, will not hope to determine the real fact by meeting in public debate, some flatly affirming, others denying the matter. They will instead canvass the available information for an answer, and wherever the proper facts are not at hand they will resort again to investigation until those facts are known—quite probably using discussion among themselves to define and clarify the problem as the work proceeds. This seems to be the generally accepted common-sense method of dealing with questions of fact.

Court room procedure may seem to be an exception, because there attorneys argue over such questions as, "Is this man guilty?" and "Has this law been violated?" Of course the highly specialized processes of modern court procedure are not an adequate guide for student debating, even though debaters can learn much from legal arguments. Yet in the court room the basic facts of a case are not determined by the speeches of the lawyers. They are rather determined by statements of witnesses under oath, and tested for truth and accuracy by cross-examination. All this is a specialized form of research.

Conference, discussion, question and answer, exposition, argumentative address, all play an important part in determining facts in those fields of life whose problems cannot be taken into a laboratory of the natural sciences. Nevertheless, men who do not preserve the spirit and attitude of impartial investigation of questions of fact, who assert a definite "Yes" or "No," who take affirmative or negative positions and attempt to uphold their views by argument rather than research, usually get some reputation for foolishness or demagogism.

Yet we debate coaches in all seriousness set our students to debating a question which purports to ask, "What are the facts of a certain situation?" even though those students are not and cannot hope to be experts in the matter. And when men who are experts

hesitate to affirm or deny the proposition (either because it is not clear or because there is lack of full information on it), our youthful proteges are taught to do so with "conviction."

Picture the situation in which debaters are placed when they definitely affirm and deny before an audience the truth of a resolution in order to determine the facts of a situation. Each must say in effect to his hearers, "Please accept my point of view, not because it has been verified by investigation, but because the information I happen to have and my powers of persuasion should make a better appeal to you than my opponents information and powers of persuasion." If the matter has been verified by investigation,—i.e., if the proposition is clear and the information on it complete,—there can be no debate at all. What a sorry commentary on the educational value of our work is the fact that some of the problems we lay before our students for debate are debatable only because of vagueness and paucity of knowledge!

Our students should be debating questions on which fully informed people may reasonably and honestly uphold affirmative and negative positions in opposition to each other with some value to those who have to face those questions. We are not arguing that student debaters should or do settle the vexing problems of policy which confront society, although student debates often do aid in solving problems. The point here is that debating reaches its highest educational value when it is brought most nearly into harmony with the practical usefulness of debate in the larger social life outside college and university.

Is there any doubt that the most important and vexing problems of life are, "What course shall we follow?" "What ought to be done?" And whenever in answer to these questions, someone proposes a definite course of action, debate comes into its own as a means of reaching a decision. Research is more basic than debate because it provides the facts without which there can be no sound argument. But only a confusion of thought would place debate in the list of useful methods of research. This is doubly true when the proposition to be debated is vague or when it does not really ask, "What are the facts?"

It may seem that using only questions of policy would always limit the debate speeches of our students to the general end of moving to action and leave belief as a general end out of debating entirely.

Some writers on argumentation and debating have distinguished questions of fact from questions of policy by saying that the former aim at belief, the latter aim at action or at least at an acceptance or rejection of belief that influences action. If this distinction were accurate, debates on questions of policy would have to come within the limits of the general end of motivation to action.

However, the distinction is not accurate. In the first place, we have already pointed out that questions of fact as used in debates usually involve or suggest some course of action; and that speakers debating a question like, "The interests of the American people would be best served by the election of a Republican President," could probably have no other practical purpose than to win votes—i.e., to move to action. In the second place, questions of policy are often argued before audiences utterly unable to carry out the proposed action. If two citizens debate before a forum on the proposition, "Resolved that Congress should pass a certain law," the only practical purpose they could have in dealing with the audience would be to secure belief in their points of view. Yet the question is clearly one of policy; it says that a certain action should be carried out.

As a matter of fact, the debating of propositions of policy, which make explicit proposals of actions to be carried out, offers far greater opportunity for speakers to aim at belief on the part of the audience than does debating about vaguely worded implications of policy. Whenever the policy is one which an audience cannot carry out, the inducing of belief is the full extent of purpose open to a debater who appears before that audience. And when the policy is one which the audience can or might carry out, belief still has a vital place because belief that a policy should be followed usually is a necessary forerunner of action. In fact, beliefs reach their highest significance in the actions they influence or determine. The truth of the matter is that the use of questions of policy enriches and broadens, rather than limits, the value of belief as a general end in debating.

Of course, no one will pretend that questions of policy are always perfect and fool-proof. Neither will anyone pretend that questions of fact cannot be discussed profitably, nor that research is not a necessary part of preparation for debate. The burden of this discussion is that the basic purposes and methods of debating and the purposes and methods of fact-finding are not at all alike; that whenever our questions of fact are requests for information they

belong in the field of research, not debate; and that usually a debater's so-called questions of fact are clumsy ways of suggesting policies of some kind. Such propositions provide no definite starting point for argument and confuse the proper relationships between the facts of a situation and the proposed policy. They should be so phrased as to make the policies explicit before the debaters begin their work. We have pointed out that the use of a question of policy broadens the scope of the general purposes for which a debater may speak. These are our reasons for saying that debate coaches should insist that questions of policy instead of questions of fact be used in student debates.

THE EDUCATION OF AN ORATOR

HEROLD TRUSLOW ROSS
DePauw University

PLATO, in the *Phaedrus*, stated that those who were naturally rhetorical might become notable orators after knowledge and practice had been added to natural endowment.[1] The lives of the great orators attest the validity of his statement, for educative influences have determined both their manner of speaking and the fundamental attitudes which they assumed upon the subjects discussed. A proper understanding of an orator's education, therefore, provides the true basis for the appreciation and interpretation of his subsequent career. The following study is an attempt to lay such a foundation for a new evaluation of one of America's most distinguished orators.

At an early age, Albert Beveridge began to dream of an oratorical career. His sources of inspiration were the political speakers who, with a flambouyant and impassioned eloquence, "waved the bloody shirt" before the partisan audiences which gathered in the oak groves of Moultrie County, Illinois, and exhorted their hearers to support the party of Lincoln and Grant.[2] He resolved to emulate their questionable example. But since there were no teachers of ora-

[1] Plato: *Phaedrus*. Translated by H. N. Fowler, Macmillan, New York, 1923, p. 547.

[2] Beveridge: *The Art of Public Speaking*, Boston and New York, 1924, p. 309.

tory in the little frontier town of Sullivan and Albert's family was poor indeed, the only training to be secured had to come from the Two Mile Schoolhouse or the Free School of the town, two institutions where Raye's *Arithmetic*, Goodrich's *Histories*, and McGuffey's *Readers* were the sources of wisdom and understanding.[3]

The well thumbed *Eclectic Readers* were a delight to the boy who would be an orator.[4] Webster's "Reply to Hayne," his "Eulogy of Adams and Jefferson," his "Europe and America" and "The Importance of the Union" were all presented for declamatory effort. In addition were Henry's "Call to Arms," Reinzi's "Address to the Romans," Phillips' "America," Beecher's "The Necessity for Education" and "Touch Not—Taste Not—Handle Not," Macaulay's "Impeachment of Warren Hastings," Jefferson's "Speech by Logan," Wirt's "No Excellence Without Labor," Marc Anthony's "Funeral Oration," Walpole's "In Reproof of Mr. Pitt" and Pitt's "Reply to Sir Robert Walpole" to be read aloud with special attention as to articulation, inflection, accent, emphasis, modulation, and poetic pause. A selection entitled "On Elocution and Reading"[5] stressed the necessity for beginning oratorical training during childhood, while another on the "Duty of an American Orator" inculcated precepts which were later exemplified in a marked degree by Albert Beveridge. His intense nationalism upon the platform was in perfect accord with the injunction: "Be it then the noblest office of American eloquence, to cultivate, in the people of every State, a deep and fervent attachment to the Union."[6] Thus from the *Readers*, the boy who would be an orator, gleaned not only the first simple rules for public performance but exalted ideas both as to the duties of an orator and of the republic which he was to serve.

In addition to the training secured in the classroom study of McGuffey's, further development was encouraged by the weekly programs which were prepared for the delight of parents and town

[3] Authority of Mr. C. A. Corbin and Mr. Sam Hall of Sullivan, Illinois, interviewed September 5, 1930.

[4] Beveridge's affection for McGuffey's *Readers* was conveyed in a letter to Mr. Mark Sullivan, and noted by him in *Our Times*, Vol. II, New York, 1927, p. 14, footnote.

[5] *New Fifth Eclectic Reader* (Wm. M. McGuffey, Ed.), Cincinnati, 1857, p. 145.

[6] Ibid., p. 254.

folk. In these exercises Albert Beveridge and his classmates declaimed, debated, and acted in plays.[7] While the training given to each pupil was meager and most elementary, it was, nevertheless, stimulating and helpful. It encouraged self development and corrected the most obvious errors in the technique of delivery thus acquired. Under this tutelage Beveridge established such a reputation for eloquence that he was selected to present the temperance cause at meetings organized in the county by the proponents of the Francis Murphy movement.

These speaking opportunities were educative, for the boy was brought face to face with audiences which were not particularly interested in his school boy display of talent, but which were composed of active opponents and proponents of temperance. As a speaker it was his responsibility to persuade and move his audience to action. The first lessons of audience adaptation and of audience control were learned at this time.

During these years, too, he received encouragement and support in his ambition to become an orator. Both parents were proud of the keen, quick intelligence which Albert early displayed, and each coveted for him every opportunity for development and progress. Equally confident of Albert Beveridge's future success as an orator was Mrs. Lotta Webster, the most dominant personality in the Sullivan High School. She exercised a wholesome influence over the boy, holding him firm in his purposes when difficulties were present, and aiding him in his adjustments to the school folk who often mistook the youth's ambition and self-confidence for egotism. These personal influences preserved the impetus of Albert Beveridge's ambition. He set out from Sullivan for college, therefore, determined to develop himself into an orator.

To do this he spent four important years at Indiana Asbury, later DePauw University. Here under the strong classical tradition which imbued the institution, he perfected himself in the art of public address.

The atmosphere of "Old Asbury," basking in the glory of having won the Interstate Oratorical in 1881, was most propitious. College life centered in the literary societies where debates, declamations,

[7] Interviews with Mr. Sam B. Hall and Mr. C. A. Corbin, Sullivan, Illinois, September 5, 1930.

oratoricals and essay contests provided the most absorbing of activities. Ability to win upon such occasions was the highest distinction which a student could achieve. Under such conditions, it was natural that the students formulated definite theories for oratorical development by which they prepared for their contests. These seem to have been largely adaptations of the classical formulae of the Greek and Roman orators whose lives and orations were studied most assiduously.

Albert Beveridge was no exception. Early in his freshman year he began a course of oratorical training truly Ciceronian. Following this classical example, he sought to make himself the master of as many fields of knowledge as possible as befitted an orator. He also began a rigorous program designed to give him deliberate mastery over every phase of presentation. He engaged in an extensive practice of composition—both of essays and of orations. He spoke in public whenever opportunity presented itself. Both in the formation of this program and in the oratorical development which followed during the years at DePauw, the academic work offered by the college was a major influence which deserves first consideration.

In his freshman year, he studied Latin, Mathematics, Natural Science and Rhetoric.[8] From his study of Latin Beveridge not only acquired a reading knowledge of the language and some appreciation of Roman literature, but he obtained a mastery and facility with words which widened his vocabulary and strengthened his powers of self-expression. From this study of Cicero, Beveridge also formulated some of his ideas of oratory and of oratorical development. More directly contributory to the formation of these concepts, however, was Townsend's *The Art of Speech*.[9]

This text, studied in the freshman course in Rhetoric, contained a brief sketch of the history of oratory, the biography of Demosthenes, a chapter devoted to the "Oration on the Crown," and four chapters discussing the ideal orator. Although many British and American speakers of note were quoted and used as illustrative material, Demosthenes and Cicero were given great prominence. The characteristics of the ideal orator, as given in this book, left an indeli-

[8] The Official Record of Albert J. Beveridge at DePauw University.

[9] Vol. II, "Studied in Eloquence and Logic" (*The Art of Speech*, Luther Tracy Townsend), New York, D. Appleton & Co., Cincinnati.

ble impress upon the mind of Beveridge. Most of the essentials therein discussed he later incorporated in his writings and addresses upon the art of public speaking.[10]

Another text in Rhetoric which also contributed to Beveridge's development was Whately's *Elements of Rhetoric*.[11] The emphasis which in this treatise was placed upon sincerity, upon the true understanding of the legitimate oratorical devices to be used for the purposes of convincing and persuading an audience, was reflected in Beveridge's seriousness and in his earnest attempt at all times to avoid the artifices of rhetoric which were devoid of meaning and purpose. Whately's insistence upon "natural speaking" as the most effective mode of presentation also made an impression, for, while Beveridge often found it difficult to achieve, he, nevertheless, considered naturalness one of the prime virtues of an orator.[12]

Of the other texts in Rhetoric[13] studied during Beveridge's freshman year, Spencer's *Philosophy of Style* must be mentioned, because it was undoubtedly one of the sources of Beveridge's firm belief that "in language the words (of an oration) should be as largely as possible Anglo-Saxon."[14]

Professor John E. Earp, who was the professor offering the work in Rhetoric, did not influence Beveridge to any extent, especially as to oratory. This, at least, was Beveridge's own estimate.[15]

On the other hand, the personality of Dr. John P. D. John, who offered Mathematics, was as influential as the subject matter or more so. Beveridge admired him greatly, for Dr. John not only taught his subject, but he was a philosopher and an orator as well. It must have been partly his influence which caused Beveridge in later years to suggest to prospective speakers that geometrical propositions were excellent exercise for early morning stimulation and conducive to habits of logical thinking.[16]

[10] Beveridge: *The Art of Public Speaking*, New York, 1924. "The Art of Public Speaking," *Saturday Evening Post*, 173, (October 6, 1900), p. 2.

[11] Whately, Richard: *Elements of Rhetoric*, New York, Harper & Brothers.

[12] Beveridge: *The Art of Public Speaking*, p. 50.

[13] D. J. Hill's *Science of Rhetoric*, Sheldon & Company, New York, and Day's *Art of Discourse* were texts used in 1881-2.

[14] Beveridge: "The Art of Public Speaking," *loc. cit.*

[15] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[16] Beveridge: "The Young Lawyer and His Beginnings," *Saturday Evening Post*, 173, (October 27, 1900), p. 1.

Another professor upon the faculty who projected himself into his teaching was Dr. John Clark Ridpath, the author of numerous historical works. Under his direction Beveridge studied Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern History. This distinguished scholar, in announcing his courses, stated that he was more concerned with the philosophy of history and with the evolution of political institutions than with mere subject-matter. "Not so much stress is laid upon the naked facts of recorded annals," ran the catalogue description of the courses, "as upon the true nature—the causes, the relations, the tendencies—of historical events." The influence of this viewpoint in the formative years of Beveridge's historical study is everywhere evident in his subsequent thought. Many of his addresses, such as "The Vitality of the Constitution" and "Institutional Law" were expositions of the place of the Constitution in the political evolution of American institutions. Moreover, in writing the life of Chief Justice John Marshall, Beveridge was really engaged in tracing the evolutionary development of the Supreme Court of the United States. Thus to Professor Ridpath may be traced the initial impetus in the direction of an historical viewpoint and interest which was consistently retained by Beveridge throughout his life.

Another statement in Professor Ridpath's announcement is illuminating in view of Beveridge's oft-expressed belief in Anglo-Saxon superiority, for it reveals that "in the lectures on the philosophy of history, comparisons and parallels" were "drawn as far as practicable from the literature, politics and history of the English-speaking race." This emphasis upon the part of a man who was greatly respected and beloved at DePauw by all students, coupled with a natural patriotism on Beveridge's part may well account for another point of view which was so important in shaping the orator's utterances during the nation-wide discussion of America's imperialistic tendencies from 1898 to 1904.

Beveridge's familiarity with the revolutionary period in France, often referred to in his college orations, was without doubt the result of hours spent over Guizot's *History of Civilization,* one of the texts used in history.

In the senior year, Political Science was offered the first term by the department of history, the History of Civilization, the second, and International Law, the third. The influence of Wayland's *Ele-*

ments of Political Economy and of Woolsey's *Political Science*[17] are easily discerned. Chapter IX of the former, on the "Cooperation of Labor and Capital" contains the fundamental thesis for the series of orations which culminated in the prize-winner at the Interstate.[18] "The true relation of Labor and Capital" wrote Wayland, "is that of partners, co-adjusters for a common end—sharers in a joint result . . . . In the production of wealth, each is necessary to the other; each is helpless without the other. Antagonism between the representatives of these two essentials to the increase of wealth is unnatural and ruinous to the interests of both."

In his solution to the problem of capital and labor, Beveridge said:

> Labor and capital forget what each owes the other . . . . Capital forgets that labor creates its wealth . . . . Labor forgets that capital alone can give it employment . . . . Labor and Capital must remember these things.

Beveridge's rejection of the socialistic program was also doubtless predicated in part upon his acceptance of the arguments presented in Chapter VII of Woolsey's *Political Science*, "Liberty and Equality in Conflict, or Communism and Socialism."

The high regard with which Woolsey was held by him was indicated in his oration "The Impending Conflict" when he said:

> . . . . In this conflict, the best thought of today, our Mills', Woolsey's and our Cook's see with prophetic eye society's impending crisis.

It is quite probable that the first part of Woolsey's text—that dealing with the "Doctrine of Rights as the Foundation of a Just State"—was the basis upon which was later built the Beveridge arguments as to the rights of citizens within a state, and more particularly, the rights of citizens in colonial possessions. This question of rights was a national issue following the acquisition by the United States of the Philippine Islands. It is also quite probable that Beveridge's theory that strong nations should have colonies for commercial rea-

[17] Wayland, Francis: *The Elements of Political Economy*, New York, Sheldon & Company, 1880. Theodore D. Woolsey: *Political Science* or *The State*, New York, Charles Scribners' Sons, 1876.

[18] "The Irrepressible Conflict," 1883, "The Impending Conflict," 1884, Capital and Labor, State and Interstate orations, 1885.

sons had its genesis in Woolsey's treatment of the government of colonies. "The policy of modern nations" ran the text, "in regard to their colonies has been to use them for the commercial benefit of the mother country and to place them under institutions corresponding with the political institutions there prevailing."[19] This statement may be said to constitute a major premise underlying such orations as that "On the Philippines."

Other studies naturally contributed to Beveridge's mental development. Taine's *History of English Literature* and Jevron's *Logic* were texts studied in other courses. In Parliamentary Law it is said that Beveridge memorized in its entirety Robert's Rules of Order,[20] which may well be believed in view of the fact that he subsequently became the Republican parliamentary strategist in the United States Senate. German and Physics were other items in the curriculum to which attention was given.

Mental and Moral Philosophy was offered to all students in the senior year by the president of the university, Dr. Martin. Here again, the strong personality of the professor contributed more to the developing orator than the subject-matter gleaned from Haven's *The Sensibilities of the Will*, Gregory's *Moral Science*, or Butler's *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion*.[21] To Dr. Martin must be attributed, in part at least, Beveridge's strong belief in a Divinity which shaped the destinies of nations as well as of men, and his fearless insistence upon ethical integrity in every sphere of activity.

The studies which have just been discussed form by no means the whole of Beveridge's program for acquiring knowledge. Although each was given thorough consideration, as his excellent marks attest, he read assiduously within a wide range of subjects. "You could always find 'Bev' in the library," said a classmate of him. "He was always following some line of reading. Sometimes he even inveigled some of his admirers to read and abstract material for him."[22] Agnes Howard Root stated that "Shakespeare was his favorite, although his reading was of the most varied character. He

[19] Woolsey, Theodore D.: *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 165.

[20] Root, Agnes: "Senator Albert J. Beveridge—The Man," *DePauw Palladium* 4, (November 5, 1900), p. 1.

[21] Mitchell, William E.: *loc. cit.*

[22] Mr. John W. Clark in Indianapolis, September 4, 1930.

absorbed Dickens and Thackery along with Schlegel, Kant and Hegel. He read slowly and carefully so as to make it absolutely his own."[23] From the college orations there is evidence of a growing familiarity with the theories of Karl Marx, Humboldt, Mill, Cooke, Rousseau, Lassalle, Spencer, Phillips, Plato and Henry George, and with the thought of Macaulay, Mommsen and Carlyle. He liked to quote from Lincoln, from Robert Burns, from Emerson and from the Bible. Three orations were closed with lines from Emerson's poem "Boston," and Beveridge's Commencement oration in 1885 was upon Burns whom he had also quoted in "Capital and Labor." Thus during his college days Beveridge ranged through prose and poetry searching for everything which would increase his knowledge of men and of the world in which they lived. This was the first phase of Beveridge's classical program of oratorical development.

Mastery of oratorical presentation was the second concern. With the same vigor which had characterized the first part of the program, Beveridge sought to perfect his voice and his delivery. The college offered little of value in this line until his senior year when Professor Carhart was added to the faculty in a chair of Oratory and of Elocution.

The inadequacy of Professor Earp's course has been suggested. During his first and formative years, therefore, Beveridge had to develop his own system of training from his reading of theory, and from the examples of his classmates who were also greatly interested in the same subject. Sam Brengle was the student who had the most influence during Beveridge's first two years. Under his direction the younger man took regular exercises for chest development and systematically practiced tonal mastery at the piano. Together the friends took lessons from the peripatetic "professors of elocution" who visited Greencastle, and practiced before each other and the mirror in the Deke fraternity club rooms.[24]

In his sophomore year, Beveridge began a rigorous course of intensive training, rising early every morning for a period of practice in the open country. "Many a morning," wrote David Graham Phillips, "I have seen him, long, long before sunrise, start across

[23] Root: *loc. cit.*

[24] Interview with Mr. Samuel Brengle, now Commissioner for the Salvation Army in the United States, Greencastle, June 6, 1931.

the snow into the woods to practice; and he would get back in time to study Shakespeare or the great orators for an hour before breakfast."[25] His favorite spot for practice was southwest of Greencastle on the edge of a wood which contained McClain's Spring. A large boulder there served as a platform desk behind which he either delivered his own orations or declaimed the masterpieces.[26] Another favored spot was near the Big Four Railroad bridge, where he practiced against the roar of passing trains. But no matter what the place, the hours were filled with earnest effort, and with a growing mastery of the art of oratorical presentation. His technique was fully formulated and firmly established before formal instruction was offered by the university. The extent to which Professor Carhart modified this must be speculative. In an interview, Professor Carhart expressed the belief that he had influenced Beveridge sufficiently to make him the winner of the Interstate contest.[27] Others, intimately acquainted with the situation, however, assert that Beveridge was not greatly influenced by his professor of oratory. "I knew Mr. Carhart," wrote Mr. Mitchell, "I think he had but little to do with Beveridge's success as a speaker. Carhart was not a speaker himself and did not impress anyone as a speaker. It would have been more proper to say, in my judgment, without any reflection upon Professor Carhart, that Beveridge was the teacher and Carhart the pupil."[28]

The course offered by Professor Carhart was quite comprehensive in its nature and should have contributed to the orator's development. The work was divided into three parts, the first dealing with the nature, purpose, and place of elocution among the fine arts, and likewise the nature, purpose and place of oratory; the second, with an analytical treatment of the mechanical and physical elements of expression; and the third, with "the practical application of the various conditions and elements of elocution to the representation of thought and feeling contained in connected dis-

[25] "Beveridge the Unsquelchable," *Current Literature*, 41, (November, 1906), p. 510.

[26] Mrs. A. J. Beveridge, in an interview, May 29, 1930.

[27] "Professor Carhart Tells of Senator's College Life," *Indianapolis Star*, October 16, 1910, p. 18, c. 1.

[28] Mitchell, Mr. William E.: *loc. cit.*

course."[29] There is no divergence here from the fundamental position already formulated by Beveridge because both were essentially classical in viewpoint and method. The retention of this attitude by Beveridge was doubtless strengthened by Professor Carhart's teaching even though nothing new or different was introduced to change his earlier conceptions of oratory.

The third and fourth aspects of Beveridge's program of oratorical training were the composing of essays and orations, and their delivery in competition and programs. Here the literary societies and the annual contests in declamation, debate and oratory offered the finest of opportunities. These activities fitted well into Beveridge's program. He became one of the most active members of "Old Plato," taking a leading part in their debates and public exercises. He also entered every college speaking contest for which he was eligible, and before he graduated, he had won most of them.

Beveridge's speeches and essays were in no sense superficial. They were the products of long study and much patient composition. "He worked on debates and orations continually."[30] With equal zeal he labored over his revisions. The best example of the way in which he developed his orations is to be found in the three extant versions of the speech upon "Capital and Labor." Each succeeding revision shows additional refinement, greater discrimination in the choice of words, and a more cogent and forceful expression of the thought. The final version rendered at Columbus in 1885 represented two years of oratorical endeavor. The habits of research and composition formed during the years in Greencastle were but slightly modified during Beveridge's long career as an orator.

The years at DePauw, then, were of exceeding importance in Beveridge's oratorical development. During this period he formulated his fundamental concepts of oratory and by their guidance developed himself into the type of speaker he wished to be. In many respects he never changed thereafter. Three additional elements contributory to his further development, however, must be discussed before consideration can be given to the mature orator.

[29] *45th Yearbook of DePauw University*, p. 234.
[30] Mitchell, William E.: *loc. cit.*

The first of these was the experience gained upon the political platform during the campaigns of 1884, 1888 and 1892. The first canvass had been made during the vacation period between his junior and senior years in college; the others had followed during the early years of his legal practice in Indianapolis. In this speaking Beveridge left the artificial environment into which his college oratory had been cast, and faced squarely the most practical of speaking situations. The audiences addressed were not concerned with technical niceties and formal eloquence; they assembled to hear a clear and vigorous presentation of the campaign issues. They came to hear the speaker but they remained only so long as he held their attention. They constituted audiences which had to be moved to action directly by persuasion and as such they enriched his experience by making audience analysis absolutely necessary. The political platform, therefore, developed powers of anticipating and controlling audience reaction essential to oratorical success.

The second factor was Beveridge's legal training, which provided a discipline in the preparation of argumentative speeches. The necessity for absolute accuracy, for comprehensive treatment and for logical analysis strengthened into habit the practices acquired in college. The attention which had to be given to the most minute of details in the preparation of briefs in the McDonald law office was later to be applied to speech preparations, with the result that Beveridge thoroughly informed himself as to every aspect of the subjects which he presented from the platform. Legal training also affected his oratorical style, because from this source he became convinced that perspicuity was the most essential attribute of public address. To obtain this, Beveridge modified his style of composition, abandoning the florid rhetoric of the spellbinders of the period in the direction of a Lincolnian simplicity.

The third factor was Robert G. Ingersoll. Beveridge while still a student, first heard this famous speaker, and was much impressed. Later, in 1888, both spoke in the interests of Judge Gresham at the National Republican Convention. The young man was much pleased with the quiet, conversational delivery of Ingersoll, and he was keenly conscious of the audience power attained by this technique. He also admired the resonant diction, although he did not approve of the blank verse tendencies so characteristic of Ingersoll. Yet, there may have been an unconscious influence,

for Beveridge's earlier oratory was conspicuously melodic with oratorical rhythm. The impetus of Ingersoll's influence may be judged from the fact that Beveridge continued throughout his life to read and study the orations of the Great Agnostic.[31] There is thus reason to believe that Ingersoll was an important influence in Beveridge's oratorical development, restraining tendencies toward pompous and florid delivery, and confirming the usage of classical niceties in diction and composition.

These factors were the final influences which entered into the training and development of Albert J. Beveridge, the orator, who in his thirty-fourth year attained full oratorical maturity, and in his delivery of the Answer to Altgeld in 1896, won national fame as one of the most eloquent speakers of his age.

THE RHETORICAL INFLUENCE OF HENRY WARD BEECHER

LIONEL CROCKER
Denison University

IN THE library of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, there hangs a framed sermon plan in Beecher's own handwriting. What rhetorical influence this has had upon generations of young preachers is, of course, impossible to conjecture. Yet, the very fact that this sermon plan, typical of Beecher's extemporaneous style, is accorded such a conspicuous and influential place is significant and at the same time symbolic of the position Beecher has come to occupy in the halls of rhetorical learning in America. Further evidence of his influence on the pulpit is found in a text on preaching by Professor Ozora Davis, late president of the Chicago Theological Seminary. This book contains one of Beecher's sermons in full and is used as a teaching model for beginners in the art of preaching. Such evidence of rhetorical influence cannot be lightly ignored. Let me present other signs which indicate the important place Beecher has assumed as a model of platform excellence.

Not only by theological schools has the Plymouth pastor been

[31] Interview with Albert J. Beveridge, Jr.

singled out as a model, but we find that in the college classroom his place is secure alongside such models as Demosthenes and Cicero, Burke and Brougham, Patrick Henry and Hamilton. Each of these masters seems destined to be remembered by one masterpiece. Likewise, Beecher made a bid for enduring rhetorical influence with his *Liverpool Address*, which, as I shall show, has been used time and time again for rhetorical purposes. I hasten to remark, however, that Beecher's rhetorical influence is not confined to this one effort.

George Pierce Baker is responsible for the prominent place occupied by Beecher's masterpiece in text-books on argumentation. In 1895, Baker included this address in his *Specimens of Argumentation*, and discoursed at length upon it in his *Principles of Argumentation*. Beecher's address, Baker pointed out, illustrates the use of several rhetorical principles. It exemplifies the use of analogy by definition. It illustrates the use of the *reductio ad absurdum* form of argument. The address also illustrates, Baker showed, the intermingling of conviction and persuasion. It would be difficult to find important books on argumentation from Baker's time to the publication of *Argumentation* by Winans and Utterback in 1930 that do not refer, in one way or another, to Beecher's supreme masterpiece. O'Neill, Laycock and Scales borrow the treatment of Baker and Huntington's revised edition and improve upon it, so that it, to-day, is the best rhetorical treatment accorded to this address.

Although, as I have said, the *Liverpool Address* is Beecher's most remarkable contribution to the body of rhetorical example, it is by no means the only one. Other speeches of the English series are frequently referred to by rhetoricians. F. B. Robinson in *Effective Public Speaking* calls attention to the masterly exposition of States Rights in the *London Speech*. Lockwood and Thorpe in *Public Speaking To-Day* refer to the *Manchester Speech* for illustrative purposes. C. P. Lindsley in an article in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (Vol. VII) cites some of the rhetorical values to be found in the various addresses of the English series. Rhetoricians, while calling attention especially to the *Liverpool Address*, add that all the speeches of this series will repay careful study for rhetorical values.

Not for one moment must one think that Beecher's rhetorical influence is limited to these speeches delivered under such extraordi-

nary circumstances in 1863. Beecher's earliest important publication *Twelve Lectures to Young Men* (1845) has served as a convenient source of illustration for F. B. Robinson in his book already mentioned. Paragraphs from Beecher's lecture *On Gambling* are quoted by him to illustrate the skillful handling of details and movement within the paragraph. Of the same series of lectures, E. D. Shurter uses a portion of *The Cynic* as an example of direct address. Algernon Tassin found excerpts of this address suitable material to include in his book of literature for interpretation. The rhetorical vitality of Beecher is recognized when it is remembered that these lectures are nearly one hundred years old.

Before turning to a consideration of Beecher's influence by precept, let me add that frequently his use of words and his handling of the sentence have served for rhetorical example. Professor E. O. Haven in a text on rhetoric quoted a portion of one of the *Star Papers* (1855) to illustrate the use of irony. Sandford and Yeager in a recent text quote a portion of one of Beecher's sermons to exemplify the "You and I" relationship so essential to conversational speaking. T. Harwood Pattison in his book on preaching cites Beecher to illustrate the exact choice of words. Many others of the Yale lecturers quote Beecher as an authority. Rapid movement in sentence structure and the development of the paragraph by repetition are illustrated by selections from Beecher in *A Modern Composition and Rhetoric* by Smith and Thomas. George Herbert Palmer in his *Self-cultivation in English* gives wide circulation to Beecher's challenge to grammar, "Young man when the English language gets in my way, it doesn't stand a chance."

In the realm of language, Beecher has come to the attention of John Earle and H. L. Mencken. Earle calls *at that* an Americanism and states that he first found it in the published sermons of Henry Ward Beecher. Mencken discovered the word *hellion* in the sermons of Beecher and called it a contribution to the American language from the backwoods pulpit.

Another important suggestion as to Beecher's rhetorical influence comes from Constance Mayfield Rourke, who, in her *Triumphs of Jubilee*, has recorded a parallel between Walt Whitman and his great Brooklyn neighbor. Miss Rourke points out that Walt Whitman and Beecher were friends. They saw a great deal of each other. Whitman was closely identified with the columns of a Brook-

lyn newspaper which found much to quote from Beecher's emotional outbursts. It would not be strange if the gray poet fell under the mystic sway of the chants that were uttered in Orange street. Professor Vernon L. Parrington in his dramatic analysis of the attack of realism upon the romanticism of an earlier age thinks enough of Miss Rourke's suggestion to include it in his pages. In his review of *Triumphs of Jubilee*, Professor Parrington referred to Miss Rourke's parallel as an important contribution to Walt Whitman literature.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Bliss Perry in his *Walt Whitman* pointed out that his rhythms were those of oratorical prose and suggested that Ingersoll might have served as his model. It is just as likely that Henry Ward Beecher may have exerted an influence in this direction. Think of that lovely heart throb which concludes the address delivered from the Plymouth pulpit the Sunday morning following Lincoln's assassination. "Four years ago, Oh Illinois, we took from your midst an untried man, and from among the people, etc." This and its companion sentences are imbedded forever in the pages of American literature. It would be difficult to find more noble prose even in Whitman. This passage has frequently found rhetorical employment. Woolbert's revised version of *Fundamentals of Speech* includes it.

Not only by example, but by precept does Beecher commend himself to students of rhetoric. His *Yale Lectures on Preaching* have already become a classic source of rhetorical inspiration and guidance. John A. Broadus, James A. Winans, E. D. Shurter, A. S. Hoyt, and W. N. Brigance, among others, find much quotable material in the lectures. These rhetoricians have acknowledged their indebtedness to Beecher and have plainly and generously indicated that Beecher exerted a considerable influence upon what they have said. Brigance, Shurter and Broadus quote liberally from his treatment of the illustration, which is, I might say, the best discussion of this instrument of persuasion to be found in the history of rhetoric. Beecher's remarks on sentence structure are frequently referred to. He is quoted by Winans, on the nature of extemporaneous speaking. And in many other ways, Beecher has been consulted on questions of rhetorical import.

It is safe to say that if it had not been for Henry Ward Beecher the series of lectures known as the *Yale Lectures on Preaching*

would never have come into existence. The lectureship was founded by Henry W. Sage for the express purpose of providing his pastor, Henry Ward Beecher, with the opportunity of describing his own theory and practice of preaching. The excellent lectures on preaching of Phillips Brooks, as well as those of other great preachers, might never have been given to the world.

Yet, the name of Phillips Brooks, Beecher's great Boston contemporary, does not appear half so often upon the pages of rhetorical treatises as does that of Beecher. None other of the Yale lecturers of this series has made such a place for himself in the pages of the history of rhetoric. Testimony as to Beecher's influence upon the preaching of his time is seen in the following quotation appearing in the *New York Daily Tribune* at the time of his death: "He not only emancipated religious thought, but he even gave direction to current methods of preaching. He showed what power could be exercised by extemporaneous preaching, when it came from a full heart and a well-equipped mind." Louis Brastow in an essay on Beecher, states that Beecher stood at the cross-roads of the break between the early nineteenth century dogmatic, doctrinal, argumentative preaching and the illustrative, expository preaching of our own day. Beecher was well known and widely read in England. He gave two lectures on preaching there in 1886. After hearing Beecher, a prominent English clergyman said that the clergy of England went home to perpare the man rather than the message. Not only has the pulpit felt his influence but in classes in public speaking the name of Beecher is uttered in the same breath and with the same respect as the name of Chatham and Choate, Gladstone and O'Connell, and the long list of eminent English and American orators.

In addition to the Yale Lectures, there is his *Lecture on Oratory* delivered in Philadelphia in 1876. His definition of oratory suggests his stand on several rhetorical matters. He said, "I define oratory to be the art of influencing conduct with truth sent home by all the resources of the living man." This emphasis on *the truth* keeps alive the Platonic conception of rhetoric. The phrase *sent home* emphasizes that rhetoric looks to communication as its aim. Oratory for Beecher was not merely speaking well, thus disagreeing with the definition given by Quintilian. Method for Beecher was not the sum and substance of oratory. The entire man was to be

called upon in oratory. Science and art were to be combined. In this Beecher is Ciceronian.

Portions of this lecture have had generous rhetorical acceptance. Professor Irvah Winters quotes that portion which deals with voice production. The refutation of the "Be Natural" theory is used by Professor James A. Winans. Many portions of the lecture are quoted by Professor R. D. T. Hollister.

Beecher's rhetorical influence is salutary. His theory is the result of blending his own broad experience with a careful study of the past masters of rhetorical theory such as Blair, Campbell and Whately. Beecher was an excellent student of rhetoric and belles lettres at Amherst, and he continued his study of rhetoric at Lane Seminary. Like Aristotle, Beecher approaches all the problems of rhetoric with the audience in mind. No rhetorical theory was satisfactory that did not contemplate the level of the audience to be reached.

In conclusion, it is to be noted that Beecher is growing in rhetorical importance. In writings of the decade just passed, more references to Beecher's rhetorical theory are to be found than in the preceding decade. Seventy years after the delivery of the *Liverpool Address*, it is referred to by Winans and Utterback as the stock example of persuasion before a hostile audience. Sixty years after the delivery of the *Yale Lectures on Preaching*, the rhetorical influence of this classic is greater than it was thirty years ago. Indeed, Henry Ward Beecher occupies the unique position of being America's only preacher-rhetorician worthy to take his place alongside those great English preacher-rhetoricians Blair, Campbell and Whately.

A SYSTEMATIC METHOD OF PLAY TRY-OUTS

WALTER H. TRUMBAUER
Alabama State College for Women

IN MOST of the high schools and colleges that present plays, it is customary, I believe, to determine the suitability of the student for a part in the play by some process of try-out. When, as in small high schools and colleges, the number of students available is very limited—(I have known of cases in which the number of students available exactly coincided with the number of parts in the

play); or when the teacher knows each eligible student intimately from class contact; or when the director has frequently directed the students in other plays, there is little need, if any, for a try-out. When however, as in large high schools, colleges and universities, the number of candidates may reach one hundred and fifty, the need for a systematic and economic method of try-out is urgent.

The usual method of try-out is to have the student read the lines of some character. Frequently the student is asked to designate the character he thinks he can best interpret. He is required to report several times to read the lines of the same or another character, in order that the director may judge him in different parts, in contrast with other candidates, and in different combinations of people. This method is unsurpassed for the final stage of the try-out process, but for the preliminary and early stages, it is very wasteful and inefficient. One of the merits claimed for this method is that it tests the enthusiasm and persistency of the student. It does; but the merit is offset by the fact that talented students resent being called several times to do the same thing, while the inferior students persist in reporting when not wanted. The method is wasteful of the time of the director as well as of the students. As far as dependability is concerned, it can be tested by less ponderous means, as for instance, by the punctuality of the student, or perhaps by his working out of a character analysis. In any case dependability should be determined after acting ability.

Letting the student designate the part he wishes to try for tends to type-casting, as the student will probably try for the type character he has done before. Timid students, who might prove valuable, may be entirely discouraged by the public nature of the try-out.

One of the most serious defects of the reading of lines as a try-out method, except as a final stage in the process, comes from the fact that little knowledge of permanent value results from it. To be sure, the cast is picked, but all the data that developed through the try-out process pertaining to those who are chosen for the cast and to those who are not, are virtually thrown away. And when the next try-out is held, the same set of students, talented and untalented, will be there to repeat the process, for a director who has almost forgotten them, or possibly for a new director. A try-out method that not only grades and classifies the students, but also preserves a permanent record of their ability and characteristics, for use by different directors, over a period of four years, is the only answer to such a situa-

tion. The time and effort spent in conducting a thorough try-out, and in making a permanent record of it, will be amply repaid, provided of course, the one making it is a person whose judgment can be relied upon.

I have worked out a method that makes a complete survey of the student. The preliminary try-out takes from five to fifteen minutes for each candidate. This will seem to many persons an abnormal length of time, but the saving comes in subsequent try-outs. The student after the first try-out reports by request only. The purpose of the method is to classify the students, to remove from consideration permanently those students that have no possibilities, to group the mediocre for possible recall, and the good and excellent students for intensive work at a later date. By classifying in this way, the director has available constantly a catalog of all persons eligible.

The aim is to discover by some simple tests the physical, vocal, emotional, mental, imaginative, and aesthetic capacities of each candidate. Students are asked to report in a small auditorium at a specific time, five minutes apart. This scheduling permits each student to have a semi-private hearing. Incidently it tests his punctuality. Sometimes students ask if they are to prepare a selection. They are told to do nothing but report at the time specified. They are given the impression that the try-out is quite casual. The purpose is to make them as unself-conscious as possible. If the student is self-conscious when he reports, the self-consciousness almost invariably gives way in the course of the try-out.

First, the student is asked by the director to go to the platform, and to state his name, his height, his weight, the color of his hair,—and if a girl, whether her hair is short, intermediate, or long. During this inquiry the voice is carefully observed for its pitch; its quality—pleasant, harsh, nasal, shrill, dull; its intensity; its carrying power, its flexibility.

Next, the student is given a list of words to read, such as: oil, beginning, umbrella, mirror, Tuesday, recognize, carburetor, dahlia, reiterate, ingenuous, connoisseur, intramural, cuisine, abstemious. The way in which the student reads the list tests both his pronunciation and enunciation. If he mispronounces we can ascribe it generally to faulty education and limited cultural background, although in some cases it may be due to bad memory and lack of language sense. If he mumbles, cuts endings, or omits sounds, we can charge it to his habits of thought and speech. Occasionally a student will be asked

to explain the meaning of a word. This test will either confirm or disprove the conclusions the director may have reached. More especially however, it will be valuable as a means of determining the student's clarity of thought and command of language. It must be understood of course, that the list of words should be devised by the one making the test for the particular community in which he is working. And the conclusions drawn from the use of the list must be regarded as indications rather than as proofs of the capacity of the student.

At this point the ability to read the printed page may logically be tested—the ability to phrase, centre, and pause,—but I postpone this feature until a subsequent try-out of those retained for intensive work.

The student is now asked to walk across the stage, to arrange a pillow, a vase, or some papers or flowers. A girl may be asked to make and place a corsage. These little tests serve to reveal the poise, the general posture, and the carriage of the body. They reveal also whether the hands and feet are used naturally and gracefully or awkwardly.

The next text is of musical ability and appreciation. The student is asked if he sings, or plays any instrument. If the director wishes to support an affirmative answer, or to secure additional data in case of a negative answer, he may ask the student to select the better of two fragments played on the piano, or to do some dance movements, or perhaps merely to do some rhythmical movements of the body, legs and arms. In certain cases, the student may be asked to spell some word, like Constantinople, or to read some sentence, rhythmically.

After music logically come color and design. The student is asked to arrange objects of different kinds, or sizes, or shapes, or colors, in order to determine his feeling for composition, proportion, color, and design. He may be asked to arrange a sofa, a cover, a screen, a table, and a vase of flowers so as to make an harmonious whole. A girl may be asked to arrange a number of draperies, scarfs, or pillows of different colors, so as to produce a pleasing color combination. Many similar tests may be added. At this point the dress of the candidate is scrutinized, and if the candidate is a girl, her heels, her rouge, and her lipstick. While these devices do not supply conclusive information, they do give valuable clues.

Depth and range of emotion, and variety and delicacy of imagin-

ation come next for examination. The test is improvising roles. Answering the telephone and making up an impromptu conversation, is one test. Listening to someone coming up the stairs, and then greeting that person with a rhapsodic outburst, is another. Walking like a blind man, and calling, "Please help the blind," is a third. A fourth is to order someone from the room, accompanying the command with the full sweep of the arm to the index finger. A fifth is to say, "Goodbye," in a very sorrowful manner. A sixth is to laugh unrestrainedly at some recollected situation. These tasks are frequently performed by mere novices with the utmost spontaneity and assurance.

The tests which follow are intended as more delicate gauges of emotion and imagination. They consist of having the student say a certain sentence several times, so as to convey a different meaning each time. Each meaning must be accompanied by suitable pantomime. The student is asked for instance, to say: "This is a pretty dog," so as to indicate endearment. Then he is asked to say it again to indicate coaxing; then again to indicate admiration; then yet again to indicate irony. He is asked to say: "I did not tell you that I would not", first to indicate indifference, then to indicate reproach, finally to indicate encouragement. Numerous other tests can be added if they are desired. In the process of interpreting the thought in several different ways the student reveals his natural rhythm, his tempo of speech and action, his power to convey a though by facial expression, his realization of the meaning and value of pantomime. From these and the preceding groups of tests the director is able to get a glimpse of the student's ability to sustain a mood, his ability to grasp and portray character, his sense of humor, and his originality of attack.

Last but not least comes a general estimate of personality—whether the personality is strong or weak, whether the student is vital or phlegmatic. The social attributes are noted. The candidate is asked if he is fond of athletics, whether he likes parties, bridge, or the movies. His type is noted,—whether ingenue, juvenile, mother, foreign, eccentric, or straight.

The method of try-out here outlined is not intended to replace the reading of lines of some character as the final stage of the try-out process, but is intended to clear the way and reduce the effort of such a reading, by classifying students on their ability. This method discovers the numerous facets of the student's personality and not merely

his power to speak lines and to mime. It weeds out early those with little talent for acting and those of poor scholarship. It gives the director information on which to cast in other ways than just to type. But most important, it makes the record of permanent value in that it may be the basis of a call for further try-out perhaps several years later.

Record blanks may contain the headings shown in the following list. The reader must understand that not every item need be filled in for every student. Some students can be dismissed in five minutes, because they are easily judged. Others that are difficult to judge need the full time and a complete record. No claim is made that this method is a panacea for all ills. Anyone using it will wish to modify it to suit his particular needs. What is claimed is that it makes an objective approach that is fair to all students, and that it arms the director with information which can be had by no other means.

Name

Physical Features	Height Peculiarities	Weight	Hair	
Voice	Pitch	Flexibility		
	Quality—Pleasing	Harsh Nasal	Shrill	Dull
	Intensity	Strong	Weak	
	Volume—Large	Medium	Small	
Articulation	Distinct	Indistinct	Erratic	
Pantomime	Facial	Eyes		
	Body	Hands	Feet	
	Co-ordination		Poise	
	Originality	Conception	Expression	
Line Reading	Fluency— Intelligence	Phrasing	Centering	
	Sense of Character			
	Sense of Comedy	Tragedy	Satire	
Emotion	Sensitiveness	Little	Much	
	Nervousness	Standing	Listening	
Imagination	Vivid	Limited		
Harmony	Art Training	Preferences		
	Music	Dancing	Drawing Painting	
	Sense of Form	Clothes		
	Sense of Color	Make-up		
Social Characteristics	Athletics	Parties	Bridge	
	Movies	Animals		
Personality	Vital	Phlegmatic		
	Type			

AUDIENCE ANALYSIS IN EARLY AMERICAN TEACHING OF PULPIT ORATORY

F. W. LAMBERTSON
Iowa State Teachers College

OUR age is witnessing a renaissance of interest in and attention to audience analysis. The more modern texts in Public Speaking are devoting considerable space to a consideration of the probable audience group: the predominant age, the educational backgrounds, cultural standards, occupational interests, prejudices, and kindred factors. Sandford and Yeager's text, *Principles of Effective Speaking*, gives an early chapter to "Audience Analysis and Control." Orr's *Essentials of Effective Speaking* approaches the course from the standpoint of the student's adjustment to the audience situation. O'Neill and Weaver's *Elements of Speech* considers such aspects of the audience as perception, attention, and motivation. Baird's chapter on "The Audience" in *Public Discussion and Debate*, considers it in relation to debate. In these books, as well as many others, we find an increased interest in the relation of speaker to audience.

Audience analysis and adaptation, however, is far from new. Possibly one of the most stimulating chapters on the subject was given by Aristotle in his *Rhetorica* where he considered the motives that impel men to action and analyzed the three types of audience: youth, adulthood, and old age.

Nor were these factors ignored in the early speech teaching of America. Since the colleges of the early day were founded primarily to train preachers, rhetoric is often sacred rhetoric, but the teachers of colonial and later times laid great stress on adapting the theme to the "circumstances," the "tempers," the "tastes," and the "prejudices" of their hearers. I will point out the contributions of some of the more significant teachers prior to the Civil War.

In 1717, Thomas Foxcroft, one of Boston's most noted divines, gave the following advice: "Ministers must use great wisdom and discretion in the managing of their Public Discourses. They must see to it that the Subject be adapted to the present circumstances and necessities of their Hearers. They must preach necessary truths and seasonable . . . . the people's wants being always to govern 'em in the choice of Subjects and not their own ease, nor fancy." Again he

remarks: "There are different degrees of growth in the Flock of Christ; and that which may be a very proper entertainment for one Soul, may be very unsuitable food to another. The Stewards of the people must see to it then, that they make a wise distinction in their dispensations according to the various necessities, and different improvements of the family; feeding the babes with the sincere milk of the word . . . . but dealing out strong meat to them that are of full age."[1]

Before the close of the century Nathanael Emmons, one of the foremost Homiletics teachers of the century, who trained more than a hundred men in his own home, wrote a set of rules for his pupils. He insists that the audience shall be the focal point when preparing the sermon. "The wise preacher," he observes on one occasion, "who means to improve the minds of his hearers, will always apply his discourse according to their particular characters. What belongs to saints, he will apply to saints; and what belongs to sinners, he will apply to sinners . . . . He will not only make the general distinction between the various individuals of each of these classes . . . Some truths more properly apply to the negligent saints; some to the backsliding saints; some to the mourning saints; and some to growing and rejoicing saints . . . . On the other hand, in order to impress the minds of sinners, a particular application of divine truths to their particular characters, is equally necessary. Some truths must be applied to profane sinners; some to self-righteous sinners; and some to awakened and convinced sinners."[2] This tendency to particularize certain type groups in the audience remained a predominant factor until the time of the Civil war.

With the turn of the century came an added interest in audience analysis and adaptation. The struggle between liberals and conservatives which later led to the founding of the Unitarian denomination, caused preachers to consider how they might present their convictions without stirring up too great dissension. Dr. Holmes, student pastor of Harvard, says: "To those in high, and to those in low place, to

[1] Foxcroft, Thomas: *A Practical Discourse relating to the Gospel-Ministry;* Boston, Printed for Nicholas Buttolph, at his Shop at the Lower End of Cornhill, 1718.

[2] Emmons, Nathanael: *A Discourse Preached at the Ordination of the Reverend Eli Smith....November 27th, mdccxciii;* Printed at Worcester, Massachusetts, by Leonard Worcester, mdccxciv.

those in prosperous and those in adverse circumstances, to those in sickness and to those in health, to the rich and to the poor, to the learned and to the unlearned, let us address ourselves with all that variety of manner which their diverse characters and conditions require." He concludes: "Let us endeavor to remove prejudice, to allay the passions, to conciliate regard, to obtain a hearing, and to open the way for the admission of truth into the heart."[3]

The Harvard professor of rhetoric and oratory, Edward T. Channing, observes: "The object of eloquence is always the same—to bring men, by whatever mode of address, to our way of thinking, and thus make them according to our wishes . . . . (The speaker must therefore) fall in with their tastes, accommodate himself to their wants, and consult their prejudices and general tone and habits of thinking."[4]

The influence of the itinerant Methodist and Baptist preachers with their easy adaptation to their audience, began to be felt keenly during this period. Henry Ware, Jr., also a professor of rhetoric in Harvard, sponsors the extempore method in his book, *Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching.* In the preface he says he is out to "break up the constrained, formal, scholastic mode of address, which follows the student from his college duties, and keeps him from immediate contact with the heart of his fellow men."[5] Ware feels that the college student is often shut off from the work-a-day world and is likely to preach to laymen as if they were scholars. This, he feels, is a mistake.

"There is one mode of address for books and for classical readers, and another for the mass of men, who judge by the eye and ear, by the fancy and feeling, and know little of rules of art or of an educated taste . . . . The object is to address men according to their actual character, and in that mode in which their habits of mind may render them most accessible."[6]

[3] Holmes, Abiel: *A Sermon delivered at the Ordination of the Reverend Thomas Brattle Gannett . . . Jan. 19, 1814;* Cambridge, Printed by Hilliard and Metcalf, 1814.

[4] Channing, Edward T.: *Inaugural Address, Delivered in the Chapel of the University in Cambridge, December 6, 1819;* Printed by Hilliard and Metcalf, at the University Press.

[5] Ware, Henry, Jr.: *Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching;* Boston, Hilliard, Gray, Little, and Wilkins, 1831, p. vi-vii.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 10-11.

The final thirty years before the Civil War saw an increased volume of books on sacred rhetoric and with it an added insistence on audience analysis and adaptation. Among the most outstanding works are Porter's *Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching*, Russell's *Pulpit Eloquence*, Ripley's *Sacred Rhetoric*, Taylor's *Model Preacher*, and Bishop Meade's *Lectures on the Pastoral Office*.

"It greatly heightens power," says Professor Skinner of Andover, "when the subject is not only of general interest to the hearers, but when it is adapted particularly to classes, circumstances, and seasons . . . . Many a speech has been deemed, and rightly deemed, of wonderful power, not because it was intrinsically well wrought, or because it was very well pronounced, but because the speaker was wise in suiting his object to the particular state and needs of his hearers."[7]

President Porter of Andover Seminary contributed much to this emphasis on audience adaptation. His point of view is predominantly that of the earlier century. "Among real Christians," he remarks, "there is great diversity of character, arising from diversity of doctrinal views, intellectual temperament, attainments, and habits." He finds the ultra-Calvinist and his opposite, the man of clear reasoning power and the one with sluggish response, the judicious and the indiscreet, the gentle and the austere, the scrupulous and the rash. The spiritual capacities of each should be considered when preparing a sermon.

Porter is the first to give any detailed treatment to the idea of prejudice. "Prejudice," he notes, "is a complex term, by which is designated the state of a man's mind, which is unfavorable to conviction, arising from interest, habit, previous opinion, pride, or other passions." Porter advises the preacher to use the indirect approach, to state propositions agreeable to the hearer, the logical implications of which will overthrow his previous beliefs.[8]

We may conclude from these extracts that audience analysis and adaptation was clearly in the thinking and teaching of the early speech teachers of America.

[7] Skinner, Thomas: *The Elements of Power in Public Speaking*; Boston, Printed by Peirce & Parker, 1833, p. 7.

[8] Porter, Ebenezer: *Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching*; Andover, Printed by Flagg, Gould and Newman, 1834, p. 146-48.

THE USE OF CROSS-EXAMINATION IN DEBATE

DARRELL R. PARKER
State University of Montana

DEBATE instructors as a class are enthusiastically devoted to their calling, the promotion and direction of forensic activities. Their enthusiasm is evidenced by the number of students annually enlisted in this activity. They have striven manfully to improve methods of debate instruction and practice; the aims of debate have been defined and the quality of the work vastly improved. Each year finds more and more students anxious to participate. Yet candid observers admit that in audience-popularity debate has suffered a steady decline during the past few years. In many of our largest collegiate institutions audiences of twenty-five are the rule and those of two hundred or more the rare exception. Not even the international debates have been able to escape the dwindling audience.

Regardless of the probable causes of this condition, the fact is that debating seems destined to become merely a valuable classroom activity unless something is done to stimulate attendance. Certain it is that one of the greatest incentives in debate is the opportunity of facing and addressing an audience. Nor does this stimulus come from speaking to fifteen or twenty fellow-members of the debate squad. It is equally certain that one of the finest bits of debate training is that which comes from the experience of speaking before a considerable gathering of interested people. Is the public wholly to blame for this condition? Can we, as debate directors, do anything to stimulate attendance at debates? I am convinced that we can do much to eradicate this public apathy.

Writing in this publication for April, 1926, Professor J. Stanley Gray outlined the procedure in what he chose to call the "Oregon Plan" of debate. The procedure there outlined was as follows: The first speaker on each team is given twenty minutes in which to present the entire constructive case for his side. The second speaker on each team is then given ten minutes in which to question the opposing constructive speaker as to his facts, authorities and reasoning. To conclude the debate the second speaker on each side is allowed another ten minutes in which to present a final refutation and summary. The most interesting feature of this plan is that it

permits one speaker to attack the argument of another by the use of direct questions. The method is strongly suggestive of the cross-examination process in use in our courts of law. Henceforth in this discussion this phase of the debate will be referred to as the cross-examination.

At Montana State University the cross-examination type of debate has been in use for the past two years. A year ago it was adopted by the State High School Debate League. During the past year the fifty high schools of the state belonging to that organization have used the cross-examination plan of debate exclusively. Hence the time has come when it is possible to draw some conclusions regarding the value of the cross-examination feature.

In several respects the cross-examination represents an improvement over the orthodox style of debate. For one thing it places a greater premium upon thorough study and preparation of the question by the participants. The first practice will impress upon the debater the necessity of knowing his subject from its every possible angle. He will learn that he must be ready instantly to defend himself every inch of the way. He will have to support and verify his authorities, facts and reasoning. His cross-examiner may attack his case at any point and he must be prepared. Questions will come in fairly rapid succession and to deliberate for long before making a reply is to admit uncertainty. There is little chance of concealing the fact of inadequate preparation from a cross-examiner who is alert and himself prepared.

The cross-examination is an excellent device for training the student in the flexible, extemporaneous style which is the goal of good speech instruction. Answering questions affords practice in impromptu speaking. It is impossible to plan an exact answer until the exact question is known. On the other hand unexpected replies constantly suggest to the examiner questions he has not previously considered. Lack of flexibility in rebuttal is made more apparent to the audience. The successful rebuttal speaker must be quick to take advantage of replies which have been made to questions asked.

The use of the cross-examination is a safe-guard against failure on the part of the speakers to reach a definite clash of opinion. It is true that the orthodox type of debate permits the asking of questions, but the number that can be asked is limited and even these can be avoided by an ingenious speaker. Formerly it was impos-

sible for the questioner to take immediate advantage of replies favorable to his contentions. Nor could he drive through with a series of questions on one point, each determined by the reply previously elicited. Under the cross-examination plan these difficulties are obviated. A speaker can be forced to take a definite stand, or perhaps, to desert his side entirely. The essential issues can be brought into clear relief. Verbal camouflage, which has so often been found convenient, loses its potency.

The use of the cross-examination increases audience interest in the debate. Every audience loves a conflict. Whether it be a football game or a battle of words it carries an instant appeal. In the court room the cross-examination of a star witness has always been an exciting moment for the onlooker. So it is in debate. The inescapable conflict, the give and take, the pitting of mind against mind, the measuring of wit against wit find eager and responsive listeners. The cross-examination period provides excellent opportunity for the injection of wit and humor into the debate. Students considered deficient in a sense of humor often respond to the stimulus of the cross-examination with a degree of cleverness previously unsuspected. A debate which is all fact and argument is usually disappointing to the audience.

The system of debate in use at the State University of Montana is a modification of the "Oregon Plan". Because a twenty minute constructive speech is likely to become tiresome to the audience, and because it calls for the presentation of the entire constructive case of the affirmative before the appearance of the first constructive speaker for the negative, a change has been made at this point. Instead of the one long speech on each side the orthodox procedure is followed for main speeches. Then instead of one man asking all the questions for his team and another man answering all those questions, all speakers are cross-examined and allowed to conduct cross-examination in turn. The entire debate is conducted in the following manner:

I. First affirmative, main speech, twelve minutes.
   A. Main speaker cross-examined for six minutes by second negative.
II. First negative, main speech, twelve minutes.
   A. Main speaker cross-examined for six minutes by first affirmative.

III. Second affirmative, main speech, twelve minutes.
  A. Main speaker cross-examined for six minutes by first negative.
IV. Second negative, main speech, twelve minutes.
  A. Main speaker cross-examined for six minutes by second affirmative.

V. Refutation and summary for the negative, either speaker, six to eight minutes.
VI. Refutation and summary for the affirmative, either speaker, six to eight minutes.

The reasons for this departure from the plan suggested by Professor Gray are soon apparent. If the cross-examination affords valuable training (which it assuredly does), all participants should share in that training. Each speaker should have an opportunity to participate both in the capacity of examiner and examined. Moreover, this modification still allows all speakers an opportunity for practice in constructive argument. Each speaker is subjected to cross-examination immediately upon concluding his main speech. Attention is called to the fact that the second negative conducts the examination of the first affirmative and the first negative examines the second affirmative. This order is used so that no speaker goes directly from the cross-examination to his main speech. Otherwise each main speech for the negative would follow immediately upon the conclusion of that speaker's examination of the preceding affirmative speaker. That would mean that each negative speaker would be in charge of the debate and the center of attention continuously for a period of eighteen minutes. Whether or not this would be an advantage, all factors are equalized by following the order outlined.

The cross-examination plan will not operate well unless certain principles are clearly understood by all speakers. During the examination, the cross-examiner is in charge. His task is a test of tact and good judgment. He must avoid offending his opponent or the audience, and yet he must not be timid in his questioning. So long as he retains his good nature, self-control and a sense of fairness, he may conduct a vigorous and aggressive examination without fear of giving offense. The cross-examiner determines the course of the examination. If he expects to be most effective, his

questions will deal very largely with the speech just concluded by his opponent. He should observe the rule of brevity. Long and complicated questions are confusing to the audience and unfair to the opposing speaker. Objection should be promptly made to a question which involves several matters at once or which assumes as true one of the points in controversy. The examiner should be allowed to insist that answers be brief and to the point. He should be allowed to interrupt a long-winded answer which threatens to usurp his time, though in fairness the opposing speaker should be allowed a reasonable opportunity to explain his answers. The examiner should be allowed to comment briefly on answers made to his questions. This is the most effective means he has of calling the attention of the audience to replies or admissions favorable to his contentions.

The speaker being questioned may insist that questions be relevant and intelligible. Only a moment is required to point out the reasons for objecting to a question, and in the majority of the cases that will suffice to cause the examiner to restate the question in an acceptable form. Occasionally it will be necessary to refer an objection to the chairman for a decision, but in practice this happens very seldom. Many hotly contested debates of this type have been brought to conclusion without a single appeal to the chair. In one instance the examiner insisted upon "yes" and "no" answers. Instead of appealing to the chair his opponent successfully defended himself by quietly asking him whether or not he had ceased to break windows in the college buildings.

The cross-examination debate is precisely what the speakers make of it. If they take the view that they are expected to imitate the narrowly technical and quibbling methods of some lawyers in the courtroom, it will not be satisfactory. On the other hand, if they realize that it is an informal process of give and take, that it is a two-way discussion which has been expanded to bring in the entire audience as silent participants, the use of this plan will enliven and intensify debate.

A fair illustration of the way in which the plan has been received is indicated in the columns of The Whitman College Pioneer of May 8, 1931. "That the cross-question type of debate is as popular with Whitman audiences as it is at other colleges was proven Thursday evening in the Montana encounter here. . . . It was the

first time the plan was presented to local students and a large crowd was present to hear it. . . . The most novel part of the debate included the short periods during which each man had an opportunity to question his opponent; embarrassing moments were the rule rather than the exception."

A few words of caution are in order. Before the debate the presiding officer should be supplied with a list of all speakers and examiners in the exact order in which they are to appear. Otherwise some confusion is likely. In addition, the chairman should be a man of ability for he may be called upon to decide the relevancy, intelligibility, or materiality of a question. While the cross-examination is in progress both speakers should stand well to the front of the platform and face the audience as directly as possible.

This procedure may appear to lack the element of simplicity. That is an apparent, rather than a real difficulty. A careful explanation followed by a practice debate will be sufficient to make its operation quite clear. The cross-examination feature is not recommended as a solution for every debate problem. It will afford the student a type of speech training well suited to prepare him for the business and social relationships of later life. As a means of stimulating public interest in debate with the object of securing increased attendance it will be well worth consideration.

SIR PHILIP BEN GREET PRODUCES*

FLORENCE MAY WARNER
New York City

A PRODUCER-ACTOR-MANAGER who has done more to make Shakespeare loved in our schools than any other one man or woman, is Sir Philip Ben Greet. He has taken his players into hundreds of schools through the length and breadth of our land, and in year after year of vivid interpretation has won the hearts of the children to Shakespearean devotion.

His career as a Shakespearean producer in England and in America has been practically unbroken since his first plunge into man-

*This article has been submitted to Sir Philip that he might check the accuracy of its facts.

agement in 1886. His Woodland Players were popular through the closing years of the Nineteenth Century as they toured England; his travelling company was successful in America for the twelve years that followed his initial venture here in 1902; his Old Vic Troupe was the life of that theatre during the War, and his company since that time has been the delight of schools in England and in America as his interest alternated in the sister countries.

When asked if the man in the street likes Shakespeare, Sir Philip replied emphatically, "Yes, the man in the street, the artisan, the mechanic, these are the people who really love Shakespeare. It is one of the great mistakes of the Shakespeare Producer, that he is so apt to produce mainly for what I may call the high-brows and the low-necks, instead of for the people." In 1916, 1917, and 1918 Mr. Greet produced the full length Hamlet on Shakespeare's birthday, and the delight with which large audiences responded to this, to Mr. Greet's mind, settled the watchword, "'Shakespeare for the people' with thumbs up."

Sir Philip opened and cultivated for himself two practically new fields of Shakespearean representation, the woodland and the school-room. Many a time, of course, these two have been united for one performance in the garden or on the hillside of grounds belonging to some school. Different lines of growth have given rise to the two types of production, however, and may conveniently be considered separately. As far as is known the first important production of Shakespeare in the open air in modern times occurred in Cadgwith, Cornwall, when Sir Johnston Forbes Robertson was there with Madame Modjeska. The performance was an impromptu benefit selection of scenes from *Romeo and Juliet*, but was widely and enthusiastically reported. A formal garden performance of *As You Like It* was organized shortly after by Lady Archibald Campbell, and other amateur productions in the open air followed. Sir Philip, beginning with his productions in 1886, was the first to try the experiment professionally. Since that time he has almost continuously had at least one troupe playing out-of-doors in the pleasant months.

In choosing a woodland setting for his open-air performances, Sir Philip looks for several essential elements; a level strip of ground in a position a few feet above an open space of some size which may serve as auditorium, and banks of shrubbery or forest trees behind the elevation which may provide a scenic background and a screen for

properties and approaching players. The screen should stretch to left and right for some little distance to shield approaches to and from the dressing-rooms. The auditorium must be easy of access and furnished with chairs or benches for the spectators. If it slopes upward in the form of an amphitheatre, or is enclosed by a garden wall in such a way as to catch and contain the sound of voices from the stage, it is much to be preferred. The choicest of spots, of which Sir Philip can find many in recent years in America, is the specially designed out-of-door theatre. And his second preference is for an English garden in which brick walls and borders of flowers enclose the spot and give color and charm to the setting.

If he is fortunate in the matter of location, Sir Philip finds a forest tree about which he can organize his performance. He makes it the center of the action, and the support for any necessary artificial screening. Sometimes it also acts as property in the play. It can be, of course, the tree where Orlando pins his love poems, the "Hawthorn brake" where Bottom receives the ass's head, the "Box-tree" from which Malvolio is spied on by Sir Toby and his crew, or the "Pleached Arbor" of Beatrice's undoing. A platform of the right height can be constructed about the bole of the tree, and the low-hanging branches arranged to form part of the setting.

There are many advantages to be found in such a sylvan presentation. It creates a pleasant scene on which the spectators may rest their gaze when the play is not going forward. It provides an appropriate frame for most of the scenes in Shakespeare's pastoral plays, particularly, *As You Like It, Twelfth Night, Love's Labour's Lost, The Tempest,* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* The fairy plays seems to respond in a particularly happy fashion to such a setting, for Oberon, Titania, Ariel and Puck, and their dancing bands of attendant sprites seem to belong to the leafy recesses and fragrant atmosphere of the woodland.

The open-air performance involves some hardships for the players, for they must manage without the usual accoutrements of the theatre, must be satisfied with makeshift properties and settings, and must speak against possible distracting noises into the limitless air. "It requires a much more skilled set of actors both in voice and style than the ordinary actors of a theatre," says Sir Philip. One production I saw, though in a garden provided with a back screen to catch the voices, proved to be so near to the railroad that there were

frequent interruptions of puffing engines, bells and whistles that made the players frequently inaudible.

Nor is the open air performance free of all discomfort to the audience. Uncertain weather, insecure chairs, sunshine in the eyes, rain in the face, and annoying mosquitoes or flies are the commonest sources of such distractions. (These, however, according to Sir Philip, "are not worth talking about except in America.") Moreover there appears to be a certain strain attached to listening to and believing in a performance that is given in the clear light of day in the experience of modern observers. However, it has the advantage of bringing drama to many a public to whom any other sort of plays is inaccessible; and it obviates some of the major expenses of the producer. Most of all Sir Philip likes to do it because the plays can be given as they were in Shakespeare's own day under the open canopy of the sky. He likes the "Broad daylight with no artificiality or smell of a theatre." The children have responded better than the adults to the illusion, and the adults have been educated to the new taste.

The second line of production that Sir Philip has cultivated for himself is that of presentations for children. When he was a small boy he loved to spend his time in building toy stages, in painting toy sets of scenery and in making paper dolls to act in his plays. He would play in his little theatre all the little stories that he knew; from his earliest days he lived in the imaginary world of his theatre. And I think that not a little of his childlike enthusiasm for the stage springs from this boyhood experience. For Sir Philip has always taken a special interest in performances for children, and has arranged and fostered such performances wherever he has gone. And in presenting a play, he brings to expression in it particularly the humor, the action, the lively by-play that appeal to the hearts of children.

In his earlier days his Shakespearean interest was a minor one with Sir Philip; he had, for instance, in 1901, twenty-three companies travelling under his name with modern plays. In 1902 he brought to America the production of *Everyman* of William Poel that swept the country before it. Within a year or two Mr. Greet developed his Shakespearean company in America, and was launched into the conquest of American schools in the name of Shakespeare. In September, 1914, at the outbreak of the War, he returned to

England and nursed the infant experiment in Shakespearean production at the Old Vic Theatre there. Here, too, the children especially won his devotion. "Any child under the London County Council who liked to play was allowed to go in those days," says Sir Philip. "And they came in squadrons. The theatre was simply jammed with children, eager, alert, excited—an inspiring sight to any true Shakespeare-lover or child-lover." Since leaving the Old Vic in May, 1918, Sir Philip has played with his own company in the city schools, the country schools, and latterly in the schools of America.

When I asked Sir Philip of his aims in production, he said, "I try to bring out all the drama, all the humour and all the language. I want to give the play simply so that the scenery will not distract the attention of the audience. I like as near an approach to the Elizabethan manner as is conveniently possible. The public likes elaborate scenery for Shakespeare or else unpretentious curtains; it doesn't like the jazzy, impressionistic, settings that have been shown in London recently." Undoubtedly Sir Philip's deep-lying purpose has been a desire to win the people to a knowledge of and a love for the plays of Shakespeare, and he has found his thousands of friends among the folk, who beyond pride of display, or the vanity of position, form the undistinguished multitude of the realms.

Sir Philip's artistic concept of the well-produced play has undoubtedly grown with the years. In 1897 Mr. William Archer could write of him that his performance of *The Merchant of Venice* was needlessly multilated by the grouping together of the Belmont scenes and the Venetian scenes, in order that the "roughly effective" sets imitating the beauties of the Lyceum stage might be used. "The Venetian populace," continued Mr. Archer, "heaves in sight in the person of two small boys! What can be the use of this save to throw into relief the unreality of the whole thing? And the hopelessly unconvincing revels of a very limited ballet-corps serve precisely the same purpose. . . . all I can say is that the results are childish in themselves, and afford no artistic compensation for the reckless rearrangement of the text which they involve."[1]

But as Sir Philip's devotion to Shakespeare grew, and his familiarity with the Elizabethan mode, then developing, grew conscious, Sir Philip modified considerably his type of production and adapted

[1] *The Theatrical World*, 1897, p. 151.

it to the needs of the play in a more discerning way than did most other producers of Shakespeare of the period. His presentation of *Twelfth Night* which I saw on Shakespeare's birthday, 1927, in Rudolph Steiner Hall, London, was in many respects as attractive an example of neo-Elizabethanism as can be found. The play was advertised as "in the Elizabethan manner with music of the period;" and it did in truth provide in most essentials for the needs of the play that grew from the peculiarities of the Elizabethan stage. The small theatre and small open stage established at once the intimacy between actor and audience that is lacking in the production on a large scale that is usual today. A cyclorama of dull blue, with open entrances right and left, formed the unchanging background of the play, and no front or middle curtain interrupted its steady progress. Two clender folds of the curtain stuff hung about midway between the front and back of the stage and effectively played the part of the pillars to the "shadow" of the Elizabethan stage about which the characters spied upon each other. They served as screens for the tormentors of Malvolio in the famous letter scene. Two or three stools in front of these narrow curtains proved to be the only necessary furniture. Two small boys in grey doublet and hose enjoyed briskly moving these about in between scenes into the proper position for the next episode to be played. A gentleman in Elizabethan garb sat at one side of the stage, only just visible to the audience, before a table bearing a zither, and played upon it the music for the fool's songs and for the momentary pauses between scenes as characters entered or departed from the stage. The play was, of course, played in its given sequence and without cuts, and had only one brief break when the lights of the hall were turned on. The most interesting experiment which Sir Philip made in this performance was the casting of boys for the parts of the young women in the play. The boys whom Sir Philip found to play the feminine parts justified the faith that Shakespeare had in boy-players when he wrote the play. Olivia showed the grace and grave dignity that became her part; Viola possessed a boyish charm, just touched, as it might will be, with awkwardness; and Maria played her part with a merry-hearted gusto that quite won the applause of the audience. The rest of the acting, except, for Sir Philip's own inimitable Malvolio, was of a less distinguished quality. The whole performance had a simplicity and delicate charm that made it a model of its kind.

The chief contribution, undoubtedly, that Sir Philip has made to Shakespearean production in our day, is the love of the dramatist's plays that he has awakened among hosts of common people, particularly in secluded rural districts, and among the children in our schools.

CONSERVATION IN THE SPEECH CURRICULUM

ROBERT T. OLIVER
University of Oregon

IF SPEECH is taught for its practical value, why should one of its most practical forms be left out of the speech curriculum?

Conversation is a type of speech that everyone uses every day, and many times a day. It is without doubt the most important type of speaking that is ever used. It is the most frequent; influences more conduct; contributes more entertainment; elucidates more problems than any formal discourse. Yet by writers of speech text-books, and makers of speech curricula, conversation is almost totally ignored.

Any speech man of the new generation will recognize conversation as the touchstone in speech training. He advises his students to be "conversational" in delivery. He explains the audience-situation by pointing out that a speech is in many ways like a conversation; the audience frames mental questions, expostulations, objections, approval, or denial, all directed at the material set forth in the speech. And the speaker must take cognizance of these various responses of his audience; must meet them much as he would meet actual questions, affirmations, or remarks in a conversation. To the extent that he does this effectively, he is a good speaker. This the instructor will tell his classes.

But the basic problem of what a conversation is he leaves them to discover for themselves. He does not explain for them the principles by which a conversation should be governed. He does not teach them to avoid the pitfalls into which the ordinary conversationalist is constantly falling. In short, he pays little or no attention to what should be the biggest speech problem of all.

Conservation is a mighty art; it is a robust art, not afraid of mingling with the people, not fearful of being dragged down from a

pedestal for everyday use. Yet it is also an art capable of the highest development, and of the utmost refinement. There have been conversational epochs in English history, just as there have been literary epochs, political epochs, and social epochs. The peak of the earliest one of which we have record was reached when Ben Jonson presided at the Mermaid. The scholarly Addison reached a lower peak with his group of intimates at Will's Coffee House. Samuel Johnson raised conversation to the highest levels it has ever reached, so far as we can know, in the meetings of the Literary Club, and in casual intercourse with his friends. Boswell, Mrs. Piozzi, and Fanny Burney have all left valuable memorabilia of the giant who achieved the greatest conversational fame. Dozens of contemporary references are made to the extraordinarily brilliant conversational powers of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, although his *Table Talk* does not fully illustrate them. But that is only evidence that half of the value of conversation arises from the personality of the speaker and the aptness of the occasion. Charles Lamb, with his Thursday evening groups, leaves us more examples of excellent conversation.

These are great figures in the history of conversation. We could hardly expect to duplicate them today. Yet they are only outstanding examples of a wide-spread social habit. The first few editions of the novels of Richardson and Fielding were familiarly read aloud around the family firesides, with spirited discussions of the moral issues raised, and with frequent interludes while the members of the family retired to their various chambers to weep over the mishaps of Pamela the virtuous and Joseph Andrews the prig. Samuel Pepys recorded the pleasure he experienced from sitting late at the coffee houses for hours of talk. So did Steele. The coffee houses of 18th century England owed their existence, in fact, to the deeply ingrained conversational habits of the middle classes.

This is all familiar history, of course, and would not need to be mentioned did it not lead us to a critical examination of our own times. Despite the arguments and illustrations of Mr. Henry W. Taft[1] the candid observer is driven to the conclusion that conversation is losing out in modern life. Members of the older generation, particularly in rural regions, can still remember evenings spent

[1] Taft, Henry W.: *Kindred Arts, Conversation and Public Speaking;* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.

by the family in pleasant discourse, or in listening to a book that was read aloud. Less than a generation ago conversation was the chief item of entertainment at dinners and social gatherings. Now the type of entertainment has totally changed. A newspaper occupies the time before dinner. A radio is turned on with the commencement of the meal. The evening is spent at the opera, a "movie," or at bridge. Or, failing these, the radio is left on, and brave indeed is the conversationalist who challenges its insistent sway. Thus the current sets more and more vigorously toward synchronized, objective entertainment, and conversation, which has been highly praised by such men as Plato, Seneca, Epictetus, Bacon, Addison, Johnson, Stevenson, and Emerson, is left to settle muddily in the back-wash.

The framers of speech curricula seem not to realize this tendency. By inference, they seem to believe that conversation needs no direction. While any speech man would fight at the suggestion that speakers are born, not made, yet he lets pass without thought the remark that such-and-such is a "born-conversationalist," while thus-and-so is a terrible bore in company, or, what is just as bad, seems to be tongue-tied. Why isn't it just as reasonable, and much more practical, to teach Tom and Jane and Uncle Ned to converse well, as to deliver speeches of introduction, welcome, acceptance, etc., etc.? The one they use, or mis-use daily; the others at remote intervals.

The next pertinent question is whether conversation can be taught; but an alert and intelligent pedagogy sniffs it out of countenance. Anything as universal as conversation can be taught; we only need to discover how. A chief difficulty was suggested more than half a century ago by Professor Mahaffy, who pointed out that conversation must seem so entirely natural that to reduce it to rules is dangerous. Yet a few broad, general principles to be followed are obvious, and every speech instructor can provide more detailed suggestions from his own observation and experience.

The best method of teaching students correct conversational habits is not to have them converse; at least not in class. The situation is too artificial, and the period too short. If the class can be assembled in outside discussion groups, the situation is better. But for class work, the best the instructor can do (and that best may be very good indeed) is to give the student some concise rules informing him what he should, and what he should not do. For instance, he should never "talk over the heads" of the company he is in; he should never

hold the center of the stage with long-winded discourses, if others are willing to talk; he should not talk about himself, unless peculiar circumstances demand it; he should not ride a particular hobby that the rest of the company has no interest in; he should not take the lead in conversation if elder people, or people of superior rank or position are present.

On the contrary, there are many positive rules that might be laid down. The conversationalist should develop and draw upon a large background. To be a good conversationalist, he needs a wide variety of interests. The good talker will "feel out" the company to discover its range of interests, and discuss them. He should spice his remarks with wit, and load them with fact and reason. He should avoid ill-considered statements, unfounded assumptions, and prejudices. He should not enter into an argument in which personal considerations play a part. While a conversation must in the nature of things be impromptu, it should be as well-planned as the circumstances permit. Addison has declared that "Method is not less requisite in ordinary conversation than in writing, provided a man would make himself understood." The conversationalist can not better afford to be lazy than can the speaker in other fields. Finally, one of the most basic needs of the good conversationalist is to be a good listener. He must be willing to take as well as to give. And his attention must be so eager and intent as to inspire the best that the speaker of the moment is capable of giving. These suggestions are merely suggestive of the many which the instructor may fruitfully give to his classes.

Any instructor who would teach the elements of conversation should be familiar with several works that might be termed "handbooks of conversation", such as Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, Coleridge's *Table Talk*, and parts of Holmes' *Breakfast Table* series. He would also find help in Olive Heseltine's *Conversation* (Dutton); Henry W. Taft's *Kindred Arts, Conversation and Public Speaking* (Macmillan); J. M. Clapp's *Talking Business* (Ronald Press, N.Y.); and Horatio S. Krans' *The Lost Art of Conversation, Selected Essays* (Sturgis and Walton, N.Y.). M. Steeven Guazzo's *The Civile Conversation* (Knopf) is an interesting record of conversation in Renaissance Italy, translated into Elizabethan English.

EDITORIALS

THE OLD QUESTION OF COURSE CONTENT

At a recent professional gathering an eminent university professor of public speaking remarked: "Speech, *the yellow dog*, is beginning to be somewhat discounted by the intellectuals in our middle western universities because it has no content." The speaker proposed to remedy the alleged trouble by making the study of literary, philosophical, economic, and political essays the content of beginning courses in speech!

That students who talk in speech courses ought to talk about worthwhile subjects on which they possess a reasonable amount of accurate information is admitted by all. However, when it is suggested that the only, or the proper, way to give dignity to our work is for us to stop teaching speech and begin teaching literature, philosophy, economics, and political science, many of us find ourselves in sharp disagreement with the proposal. It is a bit difficult to understand how the teacher of speech is going to gain the approbation and esteem of his colleagues by invading their territory and duplicating their work.

Some of those in charge of beginning speech courses have found that it is perfectly possible to use as topics for student talks the essential materials of the speech field. Why may not student speakers deal just as interestingly and profitably with such topics as: *The Most Interesting Conversationalist I Know, Dialects in the Carribbean*, and *The Relations Between the Visible and Audible Codes* (to suggest a few of which have been actually tried out), as with *The Negro Problem in the South, the Testament of Beauty*, or *The Single Tax*. Emphatically it is not suggested that political, economic, philosophical, and literary topics should be barred from discussion in speech classes. Of course, the point is that whatever subject-matter our students are discussing, they should be aiming always to develop their knowledge of and proficiency *in speech*. *If speech*

is really an academic discipline, the content of courses in speech should be the facts and principles of speech. To take any other position is to relinquish the raison d'etre of our profession. It is depressingly anomalous that we should be forced so frequently to reiterate such a seemingly self-evident proposition.

INTERNATIONAL DEBATE PROPOSITIONS

In one of last year's issues of the Quarterly Journal, the Editor spoke his mind about some of the unworthy propositions used in international debates and argued that the discussion of such questions tends to degrade debating in the opinion of thoughtful people in and out of colleges and universities. A few weeks ago there came to the Editor's desk a copy of the December *News Bulletin of the Institute of International Education.* This publication lists among the propositions to be debated by the Oxford team now on tour of America the following gems of purest ray serene: *That the Statue of Liberty is not a signpost but a gravestone; That American civilization is a greater danger to the world than that of Russia. (On both of these Oxford takes the affirmative.)*

Aside from the fact that these statements violate nearly all of the accepted canons of phrasing propositions, something might be said about the taste of the young gentlemen from England who suggest them and then casually insist upon taking the affirmative. Suppose that an American team should go to England and offer to support the affirmative only on the following: *That the King of England is an outworn relic of a barbarous past; That parliamentary government is piffle; That the House of Commons is indeed very common; That cabbages are superiors to kings; or That England's foreign policy is a menace to the peace of the world.*

We have all come to realize that in debates with Oxford the speakers are not expected to take the proposition seriously and confine their remarks to it. That is precisely one of the fundamental objections to such propositions and such international "debating" (?). If three Oxford or Cambridge students want to make an annual tour of America at the expense of our colleges and universities and put on a show of clever after-dinner speaking, might it not be better to advertise them as entertainers rather than as intercollegiate debaters? (Incidentally, it seems a bit unfair that when American

college teams go to England they find their hosts unable to reciprocate in the matter of financial guarantees!)

A committee of our National Association has been, and is now, working intelligently and earnestly for the improvement of these international forensic contests. This committee's recommendations made to the Executive Council at Detroit are printed in the Convention section of this issue. It is to be hoped that the National Student Federation, under whose auspices the English teams come to us, may see its way clear to cooperate whole-heartedly with our committee along the lines indicated in its proposals.

A NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The Wisconsin Journal of Education for December, 1931 contains the record of an interesting meeting held by the Wisconsin Association of Secondary School Principles at Milwaukee in the preceding month. At this conference the following resolutions were passed:

"Whereas, the present entrance requirements of the University of Wisconsin appear to have outlived their usefulness; and

Whereas, specific subject requirements for university admission frequently work an injustice to deserving candidates for admission; and

Whereas, these present arbitrary requirements have a crippling effect upon the free development of the high school curriculum; and

Whereas, research carried on at the University of Wisconsin and other institutions reveals the positive value of mental tests and high school marks in predicting college success; and

"Whereas such research fails to establish any such predictive value for specific subject matter; therefore

Be It Resolved, that the Wisconsin Association of Secondary School Principals earnestly request the administration and faculty of our state university *to abolish all specific subject requirements for admission to the university;* and that admission be based upon graduation from high school, the recommendations of the principal, and the scores on predictive instruments of demonstrated value."

According to reports made at the Detroit Convention the action of the Wisconsin principals is being paralleled by similar movements in other states. Evidently secondary school administrators are com-

ing to feel more and more that they have worked about long enough under the hegemony of college and university faculties. The principle of self-determination in planning the curriculum is going to be insisted upon more and more by school administrators. Even in this day only about twenty-five percent of our secondary school graduates go to college and it seems manifestly unfair to have the school curriculum shaped solely in the interest of this minority.

For a good many years one of the most serious problems confronting the teacher of speech has been how to secure college entrance credit for the work done in high school speech classes. Several able commmittees of our National Association have spent much time and thought on this question, and, in most sections of the country, it is still without anything like a satisfactory answer. If the ideas in the foregoing resolutions should come to prevail generally, one way might be opened for a complete solution of the old and baffling problem of college entrance credit for speech. Also, to be sure, those of us interested in securing adequate recognition of speech training in the secondary school would then find ourselves face to face with the necessity for presenting our case to individual high school principals rather than to college or university authorities. However, we might also find school principals freer (and therefore more willing) to include our work in their curricula than they are now while operating under the dictatorship of college entrance committees.

FOOTBALL AND FORENSICS

Last autumn a prominent daily newspaper published in the Mid-West carried an unusual news items under the caption "STUDENTS WANT TO OUST DEBATE COACH." After rehearsing the particulars of a notable case of scalp-hunting for the coach of the losing football team, the story concluded: "A petition circulated at the University seeks the ouster of the athletic director and the head football coach after a disastrous gridiron campaign. On Wednesday the football players turned up with a petition demanding the removal of the debate coach and the head of the public speaking department because they haven't produced winners. 'The debate team,' says the latter petition, 'has not made any money this year and has allowed an obscure team from Turkey to tie it in debate.'"

We recognize the tone of good natured irony in this story. Nevertheless it brings home to us again not only the unfairness of the demand that the football coach must turn in a series of unbroken victories each season but also the absurdity of expecting such a record from coaches of other intercollegiate activities. It is fortunate that in most colleges and universities the extra-curricular forensic program has not been developed—as has the extra-curricular athletic program—out of all reasonable proportion to correlated classroom activities. However, there are still departments of speech which rest their claims to support on the shaky and shifting foundations of victorious debate teams and contest speakers. More and more these extra-curricular contest activities must take their proper place as interesting and valuable accessories to the main business of speech education.

THE FORUM

THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SPEECH STYLE

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

In my article, *Four Approaches to the Study of Speech style*, published in the November issue of the Journal, I said that the Method of Statistical Analysis was seemingly originated by Professor L. A. Sherman who published his first article dealing with the subject in October, 1888. After this article went to press, a colleague called to my attention an article entitled *The Characteristic Curves of Composition*, by T. C. Mendenhall, which appeared in Science, March 11, 1887. Professor Mendenhall, an eminent physicist and astronomer (See Encylopedia Americana), was especially interested in word length as an index of style. Under his supervision, a count was later made of nearly two millions of words, chosen from the literature of Shakespeare's day, in an attempt to determine the authorship of plays involved in the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. A complete account of this experiment is found in a later article *A Mechanical Solution of a Literary Problem*, published in the Popular Science Monthly for December, 1901.

Professor Mendenhall does not claim to have originated the idea of making statistical analyses of style. He quotes a remark of Augustus De Morgan, published in his Budget of Paradoxes (1872) that "some time, somebody will institute a comparison among writers in regard to the average length of words used in composition, and that it may be found possible to identify the author of a book, a poem, or a play, in this way."

It may be that further research will reveal still other early workers in this field. In the meantime, I submit this information for the benefit of any who may be interested.

H. L. EWBANK, *University of Wisconsin*

FLETCHER'S REVIEW OF *SPEECH PATHOLOGY*

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

I have read with profit Professor Fletcher's review of my *Speech Pathology*. I regard the review as being, in the main, fair. Regarding its possibly insufficiently parenthetical comments concerning neurologists and psychiatrists I can only say that such comments have served to enliven the review a good deal. Criticisms leveled at the neglect of recalcitrant data are always philosophically worth while and desirably steadying for the student mind. Perhaps there is one aspect of the review that I might elaborate for the purpose of elimination, namely the tendency to perpetuate throughout the book's extent the Orton-Travis combination. As much as the author would enjoy the privilege of such a continued association he recognizes the obligation for re-stating that Dr. Orton may not be held responsible for the particular manner in which his stimulating teaching of hegemony has been extended. To those who have read the book I may remark that in the main Professor Fletcher's criticisms form a valuable supplement for my book.

LEE EDWARD TRAVIS, *University of Iowa*

A WORD FROM VIENNA

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Considering the interest which in your country you are manifesting in the art of voice and speech, you will no doubt also be interested in the International Association for Logopaedia and Phoniatry, which may be anglicized: International Association for Research on Defects of Speech and Voice.

This organization was formed at a congress in 1924, in order that all those engaged in this type of work might exchange ideas and profit by the results of each other's research. In July 1926, a second conference was held in Vienna, at which physiologists, psychologists, phoneticians, actors, public speakers, physicians and teachers specializing in voice and speech, singers, etc., were present.

It was very gratifying that so many branches of knowledge connected with our subject were represented, as well as the wholehearted co-operation of ten different countries: even greater things

occurred at the Convention held in Vienna in July, 1928. The fourth Convention was held at Prague during the summer of 1930. In addition to the papers given, interesting speech clinics were held by Dr. Precechtel. Railroad reductions were arranged for the convention delegates and a large number attended.

We cordially invite and urgently request as many representatives as possible of each branch of our wide field of investigation from your country to be present at the next meeting of the society which will be held during the summer of 1932. We are very desirous that your people as a nation be well represented among the speakers in every branch of our work. We hope to make this association so cosmopolitan that every nation and language may be represented, and the height of this ambition can only be reached through mutual comprehension and endeavour.

That you will confer with your countrymen in these various branches of research, and assure us of your cooperation at your earliest convenience, is the earnest wish of

DR. EMIL FRÖSCHELS, *President*
Wien IX, Ferstelgasse 6, Austria.

SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP

The 1930 Chicago Convention amended the Constitution of our NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to provide for a new type of membership with annual dues of ten dollars a year instead of the regular two dollars and a half. Those who become sustaining members under the terms of this amendment will be entitled to all the rights and privileges of regular members and in addition will receive the issues of the *Speech Bulletin* and of the *Research Monographs* which appear within the term of their membership.

In adopting this plan, our Association has followed the practice of many other academic societies. Our officers always face a pressing need for funds, and it is hoped that the additional income from sustaining memberships will make possible a larger activity on the part of our important committees and the publication, under the auspices of our Committee on Research, of some of our recent scholarly work. Those who are in a position to underwrite their share of such projects should feel their obligation to do so, and should im-

mediately communicate with Executive Secretary G. E. Densmore at the University of Michigan, and become sustaining members of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

Amy V. Allen
Lyndon Institute
Lyndon Center, Vermont

Margaret Althouse
Ackley High School
Ackley, Iowa

Sara Barber
Richmond High School
New York City

L. E. Bassett
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California

J. Richard Bietry
Los Angeles Junior College
Los Angeles, California

Dr. C. S. Bluemel
Physician
Denver, Colorado

Gladys Borchers
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

W. N. Brigance
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana

Earl C. Bryan
Texas State College for Women
Denton, Texas

Therese Cavanaugh
124 Pair St.
Paterson, New Jersey

Cornelia Cooper
1811 Jefferson
Madison, Wisconsin

Rupert Cortright
Detroit City College
Detroit, Michigan

C. C. Cunningham
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Annette Lucille Cusack
John Adams High School
New York City

Mary Cryan
Detroit Public Schools
Detroit, Michigan

Ralph Dennis
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

G. E. Densmore
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

John Dolman, Jr.
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

A. M. Drummond
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Louis M. Eich
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

H. L. Ewbank
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Annie Kate Ferguson
Sul Ross State Teachers College
Alpine, Texas

John Frizzell
Pennsylvania State College
State College, Pennsylvania

Dorothea Fry
John Muir Technical High School
Pasadena, California

Joseph M. Galvin
1015 Masonic Ave.
San Francisco, California

W. C. Garwick
Fairchild Aerial Camera Corp.
New York City

Wilbur E. Gilman
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

Guy S. Green
Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa

Alta Hall
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

B. T. Hanley
New Orleans School of Speech
New Orleans, Louisiana

C. H. Harshbarger
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Mildred Harter
Board of Education
Gary, Indiana

Violet Hassler
The Stout Institute
Menomonie, Wisconsin

Howard Higgins
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

Hoyt Hudson
Princeton University
Princeton, N. J.

Lee Hultzen
Dartmouth College
Hanover, N. H.

R. K. Immel
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Huron D. Johnson
Pekin High School
Pekin, Illinois

S. L. Kennedy
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Carroll P. Lahman
Western State Teachers College
Kalamazoo, Michigan

James Lardner
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Anne Larkin
Columbia College of Expression
Chicago, Illinois

Azubah Latham
Columbia University
New York City

Charles Layton
Muskingum College
New Concord, Ohio

Edward Mabie
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Mrs. Bertha Jackson MacKay
California Christian College
Los Angeles, California

J. H. McBurney
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Elizabeth D. McDowell
Columbia University
New York City

Eleanor McLellan
33 West 67th St.
New York City

Frederick McKay
Ypsilanti State Teachers College
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Roberta McWade
170 Plymouth Ave.
Schenectady, N. Y.

Elizabeth Morse
Morse School of Expression
St. Louis, Missouri

Henry M. Moser
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dorothy I. Mulgrave
New York University
New York City

Richard Murphy
University of Pittsburg
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

The Pacific University Library
Forest Grove, Oregon

Edwin Paget
North Carolina State College
Raleigh, North Carolina

T. Earl Pardoe
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

G. R. R. Pflaum
Emporia State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas

Henrietta Prentiss
Hunter College
New York City

F. M. Rarig
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

J. Walter Reeves
The Peddie School
Hightstown, New Jersey

Lillian J. Reifsteck
School of Self Expression Speech and Acting
Joplin, Missouri

Floyd K. Riley
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Paul J. Ritter
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Vladimir Rottenbor
Tucker School of Expression
Cleveland, Ohio

J. P. Ryan
Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa

Preston H. Scott
College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

Rolland Shackson
Junior College
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Clarence T. Simon
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Irene Skinner
Columbia College of Expression
Chicago, Illinois

Ray Skinner
College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

E. J. Spadino
1272 Amsterdam Ave.
New York City

Speech Arts Association
Los Angeles, California

Jane Bliss Taylor
Hunter College
New York City

S. Elizabeth Tyson
State Teachers College
West Chester, Pennsylvania

R. B. Wagner
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

Russell A. Wagner
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Jean Walker
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

A. T. Weaver
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

J. Dale Welsch
Elkader Junior College
Elkader, Iowa

H. A. Wichelns
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Marjorie Will
Private Studio
San Antonio, Texas

Arleigh B. Williamson
New York University
New York City

J. A. Winans
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

H. S. Woodward
Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

Gertrude Van Adestine
150 Atkinson St.
Detroit, Michigan

Helen Vergason
Franklin K. Lane High School
Brooklyn, New York

OLD BOOKS

*The Speaker: or, Miscellaneous Pieces, selected from the best English writers, and disposed under proper heads, with a view to facilitate the Improvement or Youth in Reading and Speaking.**** By WILLIAM ENFIELD, LL.D.*** London: Printed for J. Johnson, St. Paul's Churchyard; by whom the only genuine and complete Edition is published.—(1744) 1799.

This quaint old volume, *The Speaker,* "embellished with four copper plates", remains after more than one hundred and fifty years, splendid evidence of the honest and artistic craftsmanship of eighteenth century printers. To this anthology, from which the book gets its title, "are prefixed Two Essays: I. on elocution II. on reading works of taste."

The general arrangement is not unlike that found in some of the American texts on Rhetoric and Oratory which enjoyed both popular and academic favor not many years ago. The two essays form an introduction to the "collection". The first essay consists of what may be designated a dissertation on the technique of reading and speaking, in two divisions. The first section, or division (pages VIII-XXVII) is an exposition of the author's theory of public speaking wherein he offers his method of elocutionary study as the means "best adapted to form a correct and graceful speaker."

The thesis on which Mr. Enfield bases his theory of elocution has something of a twentieth century flavor. Fundamentally, he is little at variance with the public-speech-as-conversation thesis which now meets such universal approval and which not a few contemporary authorities imagine to be a very recent, original and radical discovery.

> "FOLLOW NATURE, is certainly the fundamental law of Oratory, without a regard to which, all other rules will only produce affected declamation, not just elocution. And some accurate observers, judging, perhaps, from a few unlucky specimens of modern eloquence, have concluded that this is the only

law which ought to be prescribed; that all artificial rules are useless; and that good sense, and a cultivated taste, are the only requisites to form a good public speaker. But it is true in the art of speaking, as well as in the art of living, that general precepts are of little use till they are unfolded, and applied to particular cases. To discover and correct those tones, and habits of speaking, upon every occasion, in a manner suited to the nature of the subject, and the kind of discourse or writing to be delivered, whether it be narrative, didactic, argumentative, oratorical, colloquial, descriptive, or pathetic; must be the result of much attention and labour." *

As the practical means of "following nature", the author presents the application of his fundamental principle in the form of eight "rules" each of which he discusses with considerable elaboration and without the dogmatism which is popularly supposed to be synonymous with ancient "elocution" and elocutionary technique. In the exposition of each one of the eight "rules", the author—directly and by implication—cautions the student against becoming "affected", "artificial" and "mechanical". Scattered throughout the book are numerous passages, which translated into contemporary Speech terminology, might easily pass as quotations from any one of several texts now in daily use in the best institutions of higher education.

"What", writes Mr. Enfield, "are rules or lessons for acquiring this or any other art, but the observation of others, collected into a narrow compass, and digested in a natural order, for the direction of the unexperienced and unpracticed learner? And what is there in the art of speaking, which should render it incapable of receiving aid from precepts?"

It is a temptation to quote at length the "precepts" with which each of the rules is followed. But perhaps it is sufficient for the purposes of this review to submit the eight rules, and let the reader decide for himself how far they are fitted to present Speech situations and problems.

"Rule I. Let your Articulation be distinct and deliberate.
Rule II. Let your Pronunciation be bold and forcible.
Rule III. Acquire a compass and variety in the height of your voice.

* Essay I, page X.

Rule IV. Pronounce your words with propriety and elegance.

Rule V. Pronounce every word consisting of more than one syllable with its proper ACCENT.

Rule VI. In every sentence, distinguish the more significant words by a natural, forcible, and varied EMPHASIS.

Rule VII. Acquire a just variety of Pause and Inflection.

Rule VIII. Accompany the Emotions and Passions, which your words express, by correspondent tones, looks and gestures."

Though a century and a quarter have passed since the publication of *The Speaker,* in reading the "Essay," one feels that its advice might well be offered to aspirants in many "contests"—local, state, and national—who sacrifice sense to sound and mistake empty and sonorous rhetoric for worth-while public speaking.

"A young man, who has been accoustomed to perform frequent exercises in this art (public speaking) in private, cannot easily persuade himself, when he appears before the public, to consider the business he has to perform in any other light, than as a trial of skill, and a display of oratory. Hence the character of an Orator is often treated with ridicule, sometimes with contempt. We are pleased with the easy and graceful movements, which the true gentleman has acquired by having learned to dance; but we are offended by the coxcomb, who is always exhibiting his formal dancing-bow, and minute-step. So, we admire the manly eloquence and noble ardour of the Senator employed in the cause of justice and freedom; the quick recollection, the ingenious reasoning, and the ready declamation of the accomplished Barristers; and the dignified simplicity, and unaffected energy of the Sacred Instrucor: but when, in any one of these capacities, a man so far forgets the ends and degrades the consequence of his profession, as to set himself forth under the character of a Spouter, and to parade it in the ears of the vulgar with all the pomp of artificial eloquence, though the unskilful may gaze and applaud, the judicious cannot be grieved and disgusted. Avail yourself, then, of your skill in the Art of Speaking, but always employ your powers of elocution with caution and modesty;. . ." [1]

[1] Essay I, page XVII.

Essay II, "On Reading Works of Taste", (pages XXVIII-XLVIIIX) discusses "Works of Knowledge" and Works of Taste". Relatively, considerable space is given to a presentation of the advantages to be gained by the prospective orator by the acquirement of the habit of reading "Works of Taste".

The modern teacher of Speech finds interesting the author's exposition of "The last, but not the least extensive field of criticism, Expression". This part of the essay treats the subject of oral expression, or oral English, under such captions as "Purity", "Persipicuity", "Melody", "Elegance", "Simplicity", "Vivacity", "Strength", "Dignity".

Following the "Two Essays" briefly outlined above, comes the heart of the volume, *The Speaker,* with eight subdivisions. Each subdivision or "Book", as it is called, is made up of a series of selections ("pieces", the author calls them). Each selection within a particular subdivisions is chosen as being especially adapted for the development of some tonal or oratorical quality. The method and arrangement suggest a blood relationship to the plan found in various "Best Readings", "Choice Selections", and other elocutionary texts that were so popular in the eighties and nineties, and which are still to be found in several books now widely used for "practice" and "contest selections".

The following titles of the respective "books" are indicative of the principle determining the selections:

Book I.	Select Sentences
Book II.	Narrative Pieces
Book III.	Didactic Pieces
Book IV.	Argumentative Pieces
Book V.	Orations and Harangues
Book VI.	Dialogues
Book VII.	Descriptive Pieces
Book VIII.	Pathetic Pieces

Practically all of the "pieces" are taken from the works of standard writers of good repute with a fair representation of the best contemporary writers, several of whom have since taken their places in English literature.

The first "Book", as indicated by its title, is a collection of sentences, chosen from the best authors, designed for practice purposes;

the remaining seven "books" are made up of excerpts from prose and "verse", likewise to be used for practice in declamation.

These seven "books" contain a total of one hundred and fifty-seven selections covering three hundred and seventy-six pages. Of these thirty-eight are from Shakespeare. Sterne is second with eleven "pieces", while Pope follows with ten. Credited to the "Spectator" are seven numbers, while Cowper and Akenside each have six.

The Latin classics are not overlooked, four authors being represented with six orations. English Parliamentary orators balance the Latin with six orations from six orators.

Among the "practice pieces" of the Enfield text, there are several of the "old favorites" without which no 1932 text will be considered complete and which will doubtless be included in Public Speaking texts generations after the youngest member of the Class of 1935 has been gathered to his fathers. Note the following.[2]

Lord Bacon on "Study"
Milton: "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso"
Addison: "Cato's Soliloquy"
Gray: "Elegy Written in a Country Church-Yard"
Shakespeare: "Brutus and Cassius"
"Duke and Cassius"
"Hamlet's Instructions to the Players"

Of the thirty-eight selections from Shakespeare, twenty are found under the classification of "Pathetic Pieces". A reading of "Rule VIII" in connection with a reading of the selections found under this heading would seem to justify the conclusion that the word "pathetic" is used by the author synonymously with "feeling", "emotion", "passions". Enfield seems to regard any expression of emotion as the distinguishing mark of the "dramatic", and so classifies selections in which the dramatic element is dominant under the title of "pathetic".

In the discussion of the emotional content of a speech, he says.[3]

> "There is unquestionably a language of emotions and passions, as well as a language of ideas. Words are the arbitrary signs by which our conceptions and judgments are communicated; and for this end they are commonly sufficient; but

[2] In this list the title of the "piece" is given as it appears in *"The Speaker."*
[3] Essay I, pages XXIII-XXIV.

> we find them very inadequate to the purpose of expressing our feelings. If any one need a proof of this, let him read some dramatic speech expressive of strong passion (for example, Shakespears's speech of Hamlet to the ghost) in the same unimpassioned manner in which he would read an ordinary article of intelligence. . . .
>
> "The language of passion is uniformly taught by nature, and is everywhere intelligible. It consists of tones, looks, and gestures. When anger, fear, joy, grief, love, or any other passion is raised within us, we naturally discover it by the manner in which we utter our words, by the features of the face, and by other well-known signs. The eyes and countenance, as well as the voice, are capable of endless variety of expression, suited to every possible diversity of feeling; and with these the general air and gesture naturally accord."

That Mr. Enfield believed in the study and vocal interpretation of Shakespearean roles as a valuable means of developing dramatic power in the youthful public speaker, is evidenced by his inclusion in "Book VIII" of twenty of Shakespeare's "pathetic pieces" to which he gives a total of forty-three pages or about fifteen hundred lines.

Among other excerpts he has included "Wolsey and Cromwell", "Macbeth's Soliloquy", "Antony's Soliloquy over Caesar's Body", "Antony's Funeral Oration", "The Quarrel of Brutus and Cassius", "Hamlet's Soliloquy on his Mother's Marriage", "Hamlet and the Ghost", and "Hamlet's Soliloquy on Death".

That this eighteenth century teacher of Rhetoric and Oratory was not without an appreciation of the social function of speech is indicated in the two pages in which he dedicates *The Speaker* "to John Carill Worsley, Esq., Late President of the Academy in Warrington" and from which, in conclusion, I quote:

> "In this Seminary, which was at first established, and has been uniformly conducted, on the extensive plan of providing a proper course of Instruction for young men in the most useful branches of Science and Literature, you have seen many characters formed who are now filling up their stations in society with reputation to themselves, and advantage to the Public. And, while the same great object continues to be pursued, by faithful endeavours to cultivate the understandings of youth, and by a steady attention to discipline, it is hoped, that you will

have the satisfaction to observe the same effects produced, and that the scene will be realized, which OUR POETESS has so beautifully described:

When this, this little group their country calls
From academic shades and learned halls,
To fix her laws, her spirit to sustain,
And light up glory thro' her wide domain;
Their various tastes in different arts display'd,
Like temper'd harmony of light and shade,
With friendly union in one mass shall blend,
And this adorn the state, and that defend."

I am,
With sincere Respect and Gratitude,
DEAR SIR,
Your most obliged,
and most obedient Servant,
WILLIAM ENFIELD.

Warrington Academy,
October 1, 1774.

MAYNARD LEE DAGGY, *The State College of Washington*

The Power of Illustration an Element of Success in Preaching and Teaching. By JOHN DOWLING. New York, Sheldon & Co., 1847.

During the colonial period American oratory, especially that of the pulpit, was frequently cast in an argumentative mold. Teachers of sacred rhetoric recommended to their students the use of "strong argument" and "sound reasoning." Charles Chauncy of Boston portrayed the Apostle Paul as one who "argued from the Scriptures." In 1794 President Willard of Harvard also commended Paul for treating his subjects "rationally."

With the turn of the century, however, illustrative and expository preaching came to the fore. John Dowling, pastor of the Berean Baptist Church of New York City, became its leading champion. In an address before the students of the New Hampton Theological Institution in 1847, he strongly set forth the advantages of illustrative preaching. This address, a book of one hundred pages, went through two editions in a single year.

Dowling holds that the power of perceiving and applying analogies, or in other words, the power of illustration, pervades every department of the orator's art and adds to it attractiveness, beauty, and force. He challenges those who still cling to the coldly logical method of a former century. The preacher who would benefit an audience must have an audience to benefit, he remarks, and he who deems it beneath him to utilize illustrations may soon find that he has no audience to aid.

Illustrations serve a fourfold purpose: (1) they aid in gaining and holding attention; (2) they afford scope for copiousness and variety in the exhibition of truths which have long been familiar; (3) they impress the memory by their point and force; and (4) they render complex and difficult subjects easy and plain. They should never fall below the standard of taste and refinement; not after the manner of the hair-brained neophyte who tried to prove that God would save his saints by the example of Christ riding into Jerusalem: "My brethren! my brethren! you are all asses, and Christ is riding you into the New-Jerusalem, and in spite of your kicking and plunging, he'll bring you safely there."

Dowling concludes with advice for gaining efficiency in the use of analogies. "In order that the power of illustration may be possessed in high degree, I would remark five things are necessary. They are (1) a habit of observation; (2) extensive and varied reading; (3) a retentive memory, to be used as a storehouse for the facts collected by observation and reading; (4) a thorough acquaintance with the truths to be illustrated; and (5) a readiness in perceiving analogies, that the facts collected may be applied to the illustration of the truths to be taught."

This book marks a turning point in American sacred rhetoric. It stands as the most formidable opponent of the traditional, argumentative style and the first great champion of expository and illustrative preaching.

F. W. LAMBERTSON, *Iowa State Teachers College*

NEW BOOKS

Speech Pathology. By Lee Edward Travis. Appleton and Co., 1931.

This is a strictly neurological treatment of speech pathology. Acting upon a suggestion from Orton, the neurologist, the author has adopted and has worked out in this book the theory that stuttering is due to the fact that the two hemispheres of the brain are in rivalrous equipoise. This is the keynote of the entire book.

Following the table of contents there is a glossary of terms, some pertinent to the subject, some not. Chapter I deals with the neuromuscular basis of speech. This and many succeeding chapters are supplied with cuts and drawings pertaining to the data under consideration. Disorders of speech are divided into 3 groups, (1) disorders of rhythm, (2) disorders of articulation and phonation, (3) disorders of symbolic formulation and expression. This classification ignores both etiology and psychological differentiae, and is wholly objective. A glossary of terms is incorporated. Chapter III, though headed to deal with causation in general, is practically taken up with the causes of stuttering, and is in substance, therefore, repeated in Chapter V, which deals specifically with that subject. Chapter IV offers clinical blanks and test forms, many of which are standard and useful, many out of place, e.g., geometry tests, chemistry tests, etc., etc. Chapter V is the heart of the book. In its nearly 100 pages the authors states his thesis and the facts relied upon to support it. In Chapter VI on phonation and articulation the author claims originality for dealing with the speech processes synthetically in accordance with Gestalt principles. Head's contribution to the study of aphasia is embodied in Chapter VII. A recapitulatory summary follows, and finally an index of 50 odd pages of words and sentences for the convenience of those speech specialists who prefer to be told what to do next.

"The speech muscles on either side of the middle line present", says Travis, "a situation comparable with that which would exist

if the two arms or the two legs were required to react always in unison as single structures." (p. 14) The cerebral hemispheres have a joint leadership, a "synarchic influence", over the speech mechanism. This "ambivalent leadership" constitutes the "pathophysiological subsoil" of stuttering. Other speech disorders may be conceived as lack of neural maturation or as susceptibility to injurious stimuli and hence may be subsumed under the same etiological formula. (p. 254)

Although the author says (p. 42) that "inheritance probably has significance in predisposing the individual toward a bias for a one-lead gradient", he goes somewhat beyond this position later by saying (p. 95) that "in the *great majority of cases the basic cause* of stuttering is to be sought in some significant variation in the functional integration of the central nervous system and not in the so-called 'mental complexes' and emotional adjustments." And further (p. 96), "my point of view is that in *most cases* the act of stuttering is a neuromuscular derangement secondary to general reduction in cortical lead control. The latter is conceived to be due to transient and mutually inhibitive activities of the right and the left cerebral hemispheres. In the stutterer, instead of nervous energy being mobilized by one center of greatest potential, it is mobilized by two centers of comparable potential." (Italics mine)

Abnormal fetal position has been found by Prechechtel to result in speech defects in a *"considerable number"* of the cases examined. The presumption here is that such a position would affect the normally one-sided brain control.

Somewhat as if in passing, the author mentions among the aspects of stuttering the social morbidity involved. He says (p. 135) that "the fact is inescapable that social situations affect the speech of stutterers". He goes further to say that "speech is universally recognized as a primarily social function". But instead of treating it as such he treats it throughout his book as a primarily physiological function. He does not recognize the possibility of inducing social morbidity in normal persons, claiming that it everywhere rests upon "inferior individual equipment". Why it is that not all neurotics stutter is also left unexplained.

There are (1) "primary causes" of stuttering and there are (2) "precipitating factors". Under the first are listed (a) lack of dominant brain control, (b) environmental interference with brain

control through such exercises as training of hand movements, (c) brain injuries, (d) disease. Under the second are listed (a) emotions, (b) exhaustion, (c) shock, (d) fear, (e) timidity, (f) hypersensitivity, (g) feelings of inferiority, (h) self-consciousness, (i) anxiety. (p. 138)

All of these causal factors have been dealt with by others. The contribution which Travis endeavors to make is (1) to stress the primacy of the organic factors of causation, and (2) to do this by use of the concept of cerebral gradients of control. In relegating the psychological factors of causation mentioned above to a place of minor importance Travis is decidedly in the minority even among psychiatrists whose company he seems to prefer to that of psychologists. If he recognizes that physiological drills can "interfere" with a "deep-seated physiological bias" in the way of a dominant gradient of control, what is there inconsistent about assuming that environmentally induced *states of feelings*, such as he mentions as "precipitating factors", may do the same thing? Moreover, he who would deny that any one of the lists of secondary "factors" of causation may not be induced in any normal human being would have to renounce the whole of the modern psychology of conditioning. Now, then, if they do have causal efficiency on a par with, say, writing with the non-dominant hand, they must be listed among "primary causes" and not among mere "precipitating factors", which is precisely what most authorities, in contradistinction to Travis, would nowadays be likely to say.

In support of the doctrine of cerebral rivalry in relation to stuttering many references are made to studies of preferential use of hands and eyes. To be definitely left- or hight-handed is not pathological; to be neither is. (p. 57) Of 200 stutterers a former student of the author, Bryngelson, found 61 per cent to be "essentially ambidextrous". We are left to account for the 39 per cent who were not. Of a large group 43 per cent were found to have been originally left-handed. As to the 57 per cent who were not nothing is said. Most scientists would, we imagine, be concerned about such significant numbers of cases proving thus recalcitrant to the adopted explanatory hypothesis. Not so Travis. To many, the reviewer included, it points to the need of a different and more workable hypothesis.

In pursuance of this point Travis quotes Miles several times

but he does not quote him as saying that occular dominance, while not yet understood, "appears generally demonstrable as a habit".[1] Even more to the point, Miles says that "no significant difference appears for the women as compared with the men." If, as Travis admits, (p. 97) male preponderance over female is stuttering may reach as high as 10 to 1, and if, according to the Orton-Travis doctrine, the degree of brain-sidedness is the great primary cause of stuttering, *there should be a difference.*

Also Travis quotes Parsons, but omits to quote him as saying that in a town studied by him, where all the 15,000 pupils were required by law to use their right hands, no instance of speech defect was found in a four year interval to be traceable to the execution of this law[2]—some more recalcitrant data.

In the light of the denial by practically all eminent authorities of the existence of a definite center of speech control in the cortex, and in deference to the influence of Gestalt psychology, it becomes necessary to offer a substitute for the old doctrine of brain spots. Travis resorts to the concept of gradients. A gradient is an area not so specifically demarcated, and one that may even move about from time to time (p. 31). "Gradients constitute relatively large points where the progress of some mode of behavior can be reinforced, deviated, or inhibited. They are loci of heightened integration which in turn may be subjugated in the formation of still higher integrations". (p. 27) "The remainder of the brain", the author says in the same connection, " . . . . . as retained nonrigid tissue, has been conceived by many as subserving propositional thought". "These latter areas", says he, "may be regarded as the highest intracortical gradient."

Now, if a gradient may include as large an area as you please, and if the motor gradients of speech may be "subjugated in the formation of still higher integrations", including even the thought centers, what becomes of the primacy of the control of a certain brain area, by whatever name one chooses to call it, in the production of stuttering? That the author has here undermined the Orton-Travis theory of stuttering will probably seem clear to all who have not precommitted themselves to the dogma of neurological determinism.

[1] *Journal of General Psychology;* No. 3, pp. 412-430.
[2] Parsons: *Lefthandedness;* pp. 102-103.

Do experiences, thoughts, attitudes and the like, which are supposedly mediated by the "highest intracortical gradient", have any influence over its "subjugated" area? At any rate note the difference between a stutterer's speech when his volitional attention is directed toward the content of his thought and his speech when his mind is centered upon the motor processes of speech control? Every student of the problem is familiar with this difference.

Do not attitudes of mind, the realization of social relationships play the leading rôle in determining the stutterer's ability to talk? Suppose you should stand a stuttering child up before a class of pupils and a teacher and ask him to talk. He fails. Let him stand in his tracks while everyone else is made to disappear. He can talk as he pleases. What have you done to him? Have you changed his speech gradient first and then through that his speech, or have you changed his attitude of mind first and through that altered his ability to talk? Similar questions might be asked concerning the stutterer's ability to sing, to dramatize, and to orate. The answer to these questions will determine the course of one's therapeutic procedure.

This brings us to what Travis has to say about treatment, or management, as he prefers to call it. Travis borrows terms from neurologists only. In regard to this problem the author says he can only be "briefly directional". Some general principles regarding physical and mental hygiene are offered. But the characterizing feature of the method is, naturally, based upon the author's etiological theory, and incorporates such bodily exercises as bag-punching, ball-throwing, tennis-playing, jackstones, ping-pong, horseshoes, etc. We are left without assurance that such exercises as these will alter the cerebral centers of speech control. They are, however, thinks the author, based upon "sound principles." Besides these exercises the author makes use of "wholesome suggestion". "The subject", says he, "must be regarded as an individual to whom it is necessary to sell something." His method was tried on 33 stutterers for two years. Of these 26 per cent became "completely normal in speaking". What percentage of successes was due to the "sound principles" and what to the "wholesome suggestion" we are left to wonder. Much higher percentages of successes have been reported from the use of methods totally unlike that of Travis. This fact makes us wonder still more.

Viewing the book as a whole one must say that the most serious defect is the lack of satisfactory checks and controls on the data submitted in proof of the main thesis. As a result the fallacy of non sequitur is conspicuously apparent. This fact makes the reader feel that he, like the stutterer in the author's hands, is being "managed" with salesmanship, instead of being treated as an open-minded scientist to be convinced. The urge toward originality, the overlooking of troublesome data, and the scant attention to other contending viewpoints are likely to stamp any book, however valuable and suggestive it may otherwise be, with a certain flavor of propaganda.

This book is the most modern, the most enterprisingly gotten-up, and in many respects the most successful attempt to explain all forms of speech pathology from the strictly neurological point of view. It is also, in the opinion of the reviewer, likely to pave the way toward such a vigorous examination of that point of view that either the establishment or the rejection of it will follow.

JOHN M. FLETCHER, *Tulane University*

Method of Argument. By CHARLES A. FRITZ. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1931; pp. ix, 395.

There is now no dearth of good texts on argumentation and debate. This volume, while it does not add much that is new to the theory of argumentation, emphasizes more than some books have done that an argument must be directed to the hearers. The first step in preparation, the author says, is the determination of purpose; the second is the analysis of the audience. Upon the necessity of determining the fixed beliefs and opinions of the audience, and upon adapting the argument to these beliefs and opinions, this book is very good; but the ways by which a speaker may ascertain the opinions of an audience are not nearly so well explained. To attempt an explanation would have led into the study of public opinion, perhaps, and public opinion has been as yet incompletely studied; but the author might have given a few suggestions.

"For a debater to argue against his own convictions . . . hardly encourages clear judgment on the part of either speaker or audience," says the author on page 27. Here is an old question, and one which is still far from settlement. It is my opinion, which may

not be worth much, that it does no harm to a speaker to present an aspect of a question with which he has no sympathy; it has often to be done in everyday life—the function of devil's advocate has to be performed by some one. I was interested recently in hearing an account of a meeting of a state chamber of commerce which was to draw up a referendum on some question to be submitted to the membership. The chairman said that there was one viewpoint which had not been presented, a viewpoint with which he personally had no sympathy, but he felt, he said, that it had to be presented, and he proceeded, therefore, to outline arguments which he did not believe. He did it so well that the arguments were, by order of the committee, included in the brief sent out to members. Sometimes the cause of truth may be helped by presenting all arguments, good and bad.

The advice the author gives on materials and bibliography is good and complete. His discussion of briefing is clear and helpful, although he prints only the affirmative of his specimen brief. I should think it would be very much worth while to present both sides to show the clash of arguments.

Perhaps the best chapter in the book is the one on the composition of the argument, in which the author discusses coherence, movement, emphasis, the use of words and sentences, and other aspects of style. He has many good illustrations for his points.

The chapter on group discussion leaves something to be desired, but even at that it is better than many treatments of this difficult form of argument. Professor Fritz prints an "Outline of Group Thinking Procedure" from H. S. Elliot's *The Process of Group Thinking* which should be helpful to a chairman.

The appendix lists a number of volumes containing speeches involving argument, a list of propositions, Wilson's address to Congress on the declaration of war, and a public debate on capitalism versus socialism between Professors E. R. A. Seligman and Scott Nearing.

DAYTON W. MCKEAN, *Princeton University*

Debating. Compiled and Edited by RAYMOND F. HOWES. D. C. Heath & Company, 1931; pp. XVI, 182; $1.00.

The authors of this text are Raymond F. Howes, Ruth Huston-Whipple, Ross Scanlan, Wilbur E. Gilman, Richard Murphy, Way-

land W. Parrish, Hoyt H. Hudson and Theresa G. Kahn. This is an unusual array of authorities and they have produced an excellent handbook on Debating. It would be difficult to find a more representative group of teachers coming, as they do, from colleges, universities, and high schools, and all with practical experience in the coaching of debates.

According to the preface, the purpose of the text is to fill the gap between the actual debate and the usual textbook on argumentation, giving special attention to the needs of debating in secondary schools. The reviewer has seen no text which so successfully accomplishes this objective. Very little space has been given to the discussion of the principles of argumentation. This will be considered a weakness by some and a strength by others. More about this later.

The chapter headings will be of interest in showing the scope of the text. Since the authors are responsible for distinct parts of the book it will add interest also to name them.

Chapter I. The Aims of Debating, Wayland M. Parrish
Chapter II. The Function of the Coach, Raymond F. Howes
Chapter III. Selecting the Team, Ruth Huston-Whipple
Chapter IV, V and VI are headed Gathering Material, Organizing the Case, and the Individual Speech, all by Mr. Howes
Chapter VII. Interesting the Audience, Ross Scanlan
Chapter VIII. The Individual Speech: Arrangement, Raymond F. Howes
Chapter IX. The Individual Speech: Concreteness, Mr. Howes and Mr. Scanlan
Chapter X. Speech Style, Mr. Scanlan and Mr. Howes
Chapter XI. Delivery. Ross Scanlan
Chapter XII. Refutation, Raymond F. Howes, and Ruth Huston-Whipple
Chapter XIII. Advertising the Debate, Wilbur E. Gilman
Chapter XIV. Judging the Debate, Richard Murphy
Chapter XV. Types of Discussion and Debate, Hoyt H. Hudson
Chapter XVI. Debating within the High School, Theresa G. Kahn.

The Appendixes cover (A) Instructing the Chairman, (B) Instructions to Judges, (C) Audience Decision Ballots, (D) Questions for Debate and Discussion, (E) Helpful Books and Articles on Debating.

The middle section of the book carries the coach and squad from the very beginning of debate preparation through step by step and week by week to the final presentation of the speeches. Occasionally, there is a discussion of the principles of argumentation, but more often the reader is referred in foot notes to manuals of debating where a knowledge of such principles can be secured. The reviewer doubts the wisdom of any discussion of fundamentals which is not adequate to meet the debaters needs.

Chapter V, Organizing the Case, seems more complicated than is necessary. The teacher who has had little training in debating would find it rather confusing to work out the different lines of attack as set forth in this chapter; many coaches in secondary schools, and perhaps some in college, are pressed into service with little expert background.

It is rather obvious from the chapter headings and from a more detailed study of the text that it is not meant to be a manual for class use, but of especial interest to coaches and of the more advanced members of a debating squad. As a guide for coaches it should be of inestimable value, and although the contributors are many yet there is little repetition. Every faculty adviser of forensics whether in college or secondary school will find it an excellent supplement to his manual in argumentation.

J. WALTER REEVES, *Peddie School*

Public Speaking for Executives. By CHARLES W. MEARS. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931; pp. xiv, 194; $3.

The author of this book is Dean of the Cleveland School of Advertising and Sales, and author of *Salesmanship for the New Era.* He writes with clarity and force, from what is evidently a large fund of experience in speaking and observing speakers. Public speaking for executives turns out to be nothing different from public speaking for anyone else; but executives are supposed to be busy men, and the succinctness of treatment here exemplified should appeal to them.

Mr. Mears begins with this brief summary of "major require-

ments": "Success on the speaking platform comes most surely to speakers who

1. Like people
2. Are sincere
3. Speak with authority; a genuine message
4. Fit the message to the audience
5. Enjoy public speaking."

After devoting two chapters to these topics, he discusses "Tools for the Speaker's Use," "Words at Work," "What is Interesting?" and a half-dozen other subjects. He is best on the specific practical points covered in his chapters on "Facing the Audience" and "The Meeting and the Chairman". He is most inadequate in his nine and one-half pages on "New Ideas: Imagination". His lists of recommended books in the chapter, "Meet First-Class Minds," and in the appendix are excellent, though I am not eager to read K. M. Goode's *How to Turn People into Gold*, and shall avoid meeting its author. Phillips's *Effective Speaking* is wrongly listed as *Public Speaking*.

Teachers of speaking will find here old principles given fresh statement and illustration. They will also find a good deal of sound wisdom. Mr. Mears's argument for the "manuscript-for-reference method" of speaking deserves consideration; and he does not scruple to recommend thorough memorizing. His paragraph on "Scientific Papers" may interest those who have discussed the reading of papers at conventions of the National Association. I quote in part:

> Scientific societies expect speakers to read their papers. Such audiences are less interested in the personality of the man on the platform than in his information. . . . If he chooses to speak without a manuscript that is his privilege. But if he does so, his hearers may assume that he has not shown them the courtesy of taking the trouble to select and arrange his material as a scientist should.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

Die Problematik der Sprachheilschule in Ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung. By KARL HANSEN. Halle: Carl Marhold, 1929; pp. 100. 3.60 marks.

This book on the program of speech correction in Germany is interesting in that it affords a basis for comparison of German and American methods.

The sectional divisions are as follows: (1) Cultural and historical conditions back of the public work in correction of speech in Germany; (2) basic presuppositions for the program for public speech correction: (3) plans of instruction for the correction of stuttering; (4) classes for correction of speech; (5) growth of work in correction of speech; (6) the speech programs of foreign countries.

The training in speech developed as one phase of a general program of corrective work which included reeducation of the blind, the deaf, the crippled and the feeble minded. In 1919, the German government demanded that this work be taken out of private hands and placed in the control of the state.

Although Gutzmann's phonetic methods were practiced for a number of years, there developed an increasing emphasis upon the physiologic and psychologic factors in speech reeducation. It was found that the mechanical recitation of Guztmann's drills did not produce the desired results.

The methods of correction of speech in Germany today apparently are as diverse as they are in America. In all the discussion one idea is dominant: The child must be considered as a biologic unit. Treat the child, not the disorder.

According to Nadoleszmy, the best program for stutterers should include the following steps: (1) voiceless articulation, (2) singing, (3) rhythmic speaking, (4) slow, monotonous, monodynamic, monotemporal speech, (5) repetitive speech, (6) after deep inspiration, the utterance of nonsense syllables as they may occur to the stutterer, (7), scanning or a staccato form of utterance, (8) full voice rising with the melody, and (9) "legato" speaking.

Somewhat different is the program of M. A. Richardson who believes that exercises are only a means of gaining confidence in speaking. Through auto-suggestion, relaxation exercises, imitation, the child gains quietness and ease in speaking.

Both group and individual instruction are carried on in the schools. The work in speech often is correlated with work in reading, writing, and singing. The groups are organized according to age, scholastic achievement, intelligence quotient, and the kind and degree of severity of the defect.

Various criteria are set up for determining improvement. Such laboratory materials as the pneumograph, phonograph, laryngograph,

photographic camera, stroboscope, and the labiograph are used quite generally.

The author states that the teacher's training should include general and vocal anatomy, physiology, neuropathology, psychology, speech pathology, phonetics, development of language of children, and pedagogy.

To the difficult question: "When is a child cured?" he makes this answer: 'A child may be said to be cured when he uses esthetically satisfactory and phonetically correct speech in relation to the environment in which he lives.'

MILDRED FREBURG BERRY, *Rockford College*

An Analytical Contrast of Oral With Written English. By PAUL P. BUSHNELL, Ph.D. Columbia University Press, New York, 1930.

Dr. Bushnell secured 100 manuscripts of written English from students of the tenth grade. He also secured 100 stenographic reports of speeches delivered by the same students. From this material, he seeks to draw conclusions regarding the compositions, using the Van Wagenen Scale. Five graduate students in English at Columbia acted as judges. He concludes that "Written expression has been disclosed by the present study as consistently superior to oral expression in the qualities of thought content and sentence structure, and as less subject to nearly all kinds of error. Pair by pair comparison of the language products of the same persons, tenth grade pupils, has shown that the oral members are in general more fluid, unorganized, and incoherent than the written." Dr. Bushnell states that the disparity between oral and written English need not exist. With training, it can be removed. Spoken language can be brought up to the level of written English. "By far the most evident and important difference between written and oral themes appears to be that of preciseness-looseness." One wonders why written language should be taken as the norm. Why should oral language be made to conform to the standards of written English? Such writers as Lafcadio Hearn counseled that the writer should write as he speaks. Robert Frost tries to catch the conversational tone of the spoken word. In checking spoken language with written composition we are likely to construct an artificial, formal language of the tongue. The speaking situation is so different from the writ-

ing situation; so many more elements enter into the utterance of a speech. Beecher's well known statement, quoted by George Herbert Palmer in his *Self-Cultivation in English*, hits the nail on the head. "When the English language gets in my way, it doesn't stand a chance." As Professor Howard Higgins said in the November issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, there is something more to a speech than its rhetoric. For example, vocabulary in speaking is vastly different from vocabulary in writing. Inflection makes one word many words in speaking. Bushnell states, "Written English should be used somehow as a guide or model for oral English." Conwell never wrote out his address. Beecher said writing killed inspiration. Recently, Sherwood Anderson said that for twenty years he had been training the impulse to travel down his arms to the keys of his typewriter. He recognized that good writing does not insure good speaking. He apologizes to an audience for his poor speaking. Speakers usually edit their speeches for publication. This is an admission of the difference between writing and speaking. I believe that Dr. Bushnell's conclusion is pedantic because it deals with such a relatively unimportant factor in oral composition.

LIONEL CROCKER, *Denison University*

Ambidexterity and Mental Culture. By H. MACNAUGHTON-JONES. Rebman Company, New York City. No date. 102 pages.

At a time when there seems to be a revival of the literature on the relation of handedness to speech, this brochure, an extension of articles originally appearing in *The Child*, may be dusted off and read for background material.

The first of the five chapters of this little book deals with a statement concerning some of the theories which might account for predominant right-handedness, and considers "environment, circumstance, education, and heredity" as the factors to which study may be given in any attempt to explain preferential handedness. The author's statement that "it [left-handedness] was twice as common in men as in women," will probably be correlated with the fact that there is also a greater number of male stutterers. Mr. Jackson (John) is quoted to the effect that "in at least three per cent. of births there is an incurable bias to left-handedness, and in seven-

teen per cent. to right; and that the eighty per cent. balance is normally ambidextrous." (p. 22)

The second chapter takes up the part played by the brain in ambidexterity. The following are given as accepted facts: "(1) The brain is a dual organ, and each hemisphere is capable of independent action. (2) Though the left hemisphere is almost universally the one that takes command, and assumes functional activity and control, this has had an accidental origin, and is due to inherited selective influences, and not to any structural or physiological difference between it and the right. (3) There is an intimate relation between muscle movement and surface (peripheral) sensitiveness and brain activity and culture. (4) The speech and writing centres at either side are thus influenced by right or left-handedness, and each can, with education, discharge the function of the other, when, through accident or disease, either is rendered useless. (5) Speech and writing involve the highest initiative intellectual processes." (pp. 32-3). Ambidexterity as a national element responsible for learning and advancement is pointed out in the case of the Scythians, ancient Egyptians, Persians, and Japanese.

Ambidexterity in Relation to Writing, Drawing and Music (Chapter III), The Montessori Method and Ambidexterity (Chapter IV), and Ambidextrous Work (Chapter V) complete the book with indications of applications of double-handedness to manual tasks and to learning. The last three pages are devoted to the short, signed opinions of eleven doctors testifying to the advantages of ambidexterity. Dr. Church writes, "In all cases of aphasia brought to me for treatment, I have instituted the systematic exercises of the left hand for writing; and I was invariably able to show a distinct parallelism between the improvement in the power of articulation and improvement in writing with the left hand." (p. 101).

LYMAN S. JUDSON, *Alabama Polytechnic Institute*

IN THE PERIODICALS

JACKSON, ANNE E. M.: *An Apology for Lectures.* Journal of Adult Education, Vol. III, No. 4, October, 1931, pp. 438-442.

"In a manner of speaking a lecture is the dramatization of an idea or of a series of ideas." However, the lecture, as an educational technique, has fallen into some disrepute. Perhaps this is due to the fact that there are many lecturers "whose flow of words impedes their flow of ideas. . . ." For the purposes of adult education the author manifests an interest in the speaker "who has ideas that he expresses happily, and who rises to eloquence only when he has something to be eloquent about."

Discussion should always follow the lecture. The informal give-and-take of the forum enables the bearer of a message to view his ideas from all angles. "Competition is the life of progressive thinking as well as of trade." "Discussion clears up obscurities and prevents that final feeling of infallibility which many professional lecturers come to have."

The author favors the establishment of more forums and discussions groups such as are conducted by Cooper Union and the New School for Social Research.

LESTER W. THONSSEN, *College of the City of New York*

BRIDGES, GRACE. *Radio, A Medium for Speech Training.* The Platoon School. Vol. V, No. 3, Sept., 1931, pp. 323-35.

The radio may be used in two ways: (1) to give the student the opportunity to hear good speakers, readers and actors; and (2) to give the students in other schools the chance to hear programs given by the more gifted members of speech classes. In Portland, Oregon, a local radio station assigned two thirty-minute periods a week to such programs which were directed by the auditorium teachers. The experiment was a success and will be repeated in 1931-32.

H. L. E.

GARRISON, S. C., and HEARD, MINNIE TAYLOR: *An Experimental Study of the Value of Phonetics.* Peabody Journal of Education, 1931, Vol. 9, 9-14.

In the George Peabody College for Teachers, children in the first, second and third grades were divided into two groups, the "bright," (those having I.Q's above 100) and the "dull," (those having I.Q's below 100.) These were again subdivided, part of each group being given phonetic training, and part non-phonetic training. Daugherty's "The Teaching of Phonetics" was closely followed for those receiving instruction in phonetics. Reading (oral and silent), spelling, and pronunciation exercises and drills were given and various tests applied.

The general conclusions seem to indicate that for the lowest grades phonetic training may be a distinct handicap in oral reading, though in pronunciation and spelling those having had phonetic training seem to have a slight advantage. In the lowest grades, loss during vacation is greatest among those having had such training, while in the higher grades the reverse is true. G. W. G.

FRENCH, N. L., CARTER, C. W. JR., and KOENIG, W., JR.: *The Words and Sounds of Telephone Conversations.* Bell System Technical Journal, 1930, Vol. 9, 290-324.

Five hundred conversations were observed for nouns, five hundred for verbs, one hundred fifty for adverbs and adjectives, and the other parts of speech about one hundred fifty each. Of these conversations, 89% were business calls, 86% were between two men, and 10% between two women. About 80,000 words were obtained, of which there were 2,240 different words. 1029 were nouns, 634 adjectives and adverbs, 456 were verbs. Only 737 words occurred more than four times.

The material was compared with Dewey's results for written English. Conversation has fewer different words, more polysyllabic words, and more Latin derivations. The vowels (and diphthongs) (ɪ), (aɪ), (æ), (ɛ), (i), (u) and (ɒ) or perhaps (ɑ) as in "pot", account for half of all vowels. The consonants (w), (t), (ð), (j), (d), (m), (h) and (k) account for half of all initial consontants, and (t), (ɹ), (n), (l) and (z) for half of all final consonants. The distribution of sounds is close to that in written

English, with the major differences due to a few words characteristic of speech. G. W. G.

Lafount, Harold A. (Federal Radio Commissioner), writing in the *United States Daily*, makes an interesting and enlightening comparison between the American and British radio institutions, and, in addition, throws some light on the controversy, such as it is, between educational and commercial broadcast systems. Government control, such as prevails in England, he points out, would be impossible in this country, partly because of the enormous cost of supervision, and also since it is not at all certain that the quality of the programs would be at all improved.

Commercialism, he says, is the heart of broadcasting in the United States. Programs are, in the main, sponsored by advertisers, who give the type of entertainment that the listeners will accept; if the public wanted educational programs, advertisers would be just as quick to provide them as they are at present to sponsor entertainment. "What has education contributed to radio? Not one thing. What has commercialism contributed? Everything; the life blood of the industry. . . . If educational programs could be brought up to the high-interest point of popular programs, they would be received in an equally welcome spirit by American listeners. . . . If educators can show stations that the public wants their programs, educational broadcasts will have a prominent place on the programs of every station in the United States." (Quoted in *School and Society*, December 5, Vol. 34, 1931, pp. 758-760).

G. W. G.

Those who are most persistent and vociferous in their clamoring for a universal and standard form of English pronunciation will not receive a great amount of encouragement in the announced program of the American Council of Learned Societies to sponsor the construction of a Linguistic Atlas of the United States. Work on this program, according to a brief article appearing in *School and Society*, August 1, 1931, was to have begun in September in New England, and is being directed by Dr. Hans Kurath, a noted authority on American dialects.

It is not the purpose, according to a statement by Dr. Kurath,

to make invidious comparisons between regional variations in pronunciation, nor to suggest that any of these variations are any less "correct" than any others. For any given locality its own pronunciation is right. It is hoped, however, that a more charitable attitude be taken toward local dialects—a most worthy aim in itself—and that due recognition be taken of their legitimacy. "A standard of pronunciation is not desirable except for the stage, and that represents such a small proportion of our national life."

G. W. G.

THE CONVENTIONS

THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH

Hotel Statler—Detroit, Michigan
December 28, 29, and 30, 1931

* * * *

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Sunday, December 27, 1931
2:15 P.M.

President Simon read to the Council a letter of greeting from Professor Thomas C. Trueblood, long-time member and friend of the Association.

The report of the May meeting of the Executive Council held at Madison, Wisconsin, May 8, 1931, was read.

Cortright, Chairman of Committee on Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools, presented the report of his committee with the following recommendations:

> "Your Committee urges; (1) that the National Association of Teachers of Speech through a committee appointed by the President make every possible effort to develop active state organizations, new and old, of teachers of Speech; (2) that this committee work through new and old regional and state associations to secure the acceptance of high school work in Speech as entrance credit by the local state University, and the local college and universities.
>
> Since adequate professional training is a weakness of teachers of Speech both in high schools and in colleges, this committee recommends that regional and state associations be urged to study this problem and to formulate cooperatively plans and recommendations whereby our profession may, in this respect, be strengthened.
>
> Your committee recommends, following the suggestion of our Association secretary, that favorable consideration be given to the inclusion of bulletin material in the regular issues of the Quarterly Journal of Speech, beginning with the fall issue of 1932.
>
> Your committee hopes that the appointment of a new chairman of this committee may be made by the outgoing president as early as possible, thus insuring continuity of program in our work."

Lahman, Chairman of Committee on Speech Training in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools, sent the following report to the Council:

> "Following the recommendations of a year ago, the Committee on Speech Education in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools has remained intact during the past year, but has been largely inactive.

The one official committee activity has been the establishing of very promising contacts with the director and consultants of the National Survey of the Education of Teachers being conducted over a period of three years by the United States Bureau of Education at Washington.

As to the future of the committee, I am uncertain as to what to recommend. It will be remembered that the point under, "Summary and Recommendations" of our committee report, printed in the Quarterly Journal for February, 1930, read: 'That two questions not investigated by this committee should be given attention and investigation; (1) What should be the content and organization of specific courses as adapted to the needs of prospective teachers? (2) In terms of courses, activities, and personal skill, what should constitute the training and equipment of the specialized speech teacher in high school and grades? To these two matters of standardization the best thought of speech teachers not only in teacher-training institutions, but in colleges, universities, and public schools should be directed.'

To these two fields for investigation Dr. Virginia Sanderson, member of the committee from San Jose State Teachers College, California, has very pertinently proposed a third: 'What should be suggested as a unit for the general elementary school teacher?'

In view of the comprehensive survey already referred to, now being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Education with which contacts have already been made, it would seem that the present is the logical time for the National Association of Teachers of Speech to investigate the three fields just mentioned. On the other hand, this seems a sort of investigation that will require such a considerable amount of time that at least part of it might well be done as graduate work, and perhaps such findings should precede committee investigation and recommendation. If and when such a committee is appointed, it should, it seems to me, be relatively small or at least have a compact steering group, members of which are within easy geographical access to one another. On this committee there should be the best qualified people the profession has to offer and they should be drawn from Teachers Colleges, Universities, Colleges, High Schools, and Elementary Schools. There should also be asked to serve, in either active or advisory capacity, representatives of State Departments of Education, of City School Administrations, of University Schools or Departments of Education. There should be the closest cooperation between this new committee and other committees of the National Association, particularly that on the Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools.

If this new committee, which might be called the Committee on Speech Training for Teachers in Public Schools, is authorized at this time, then I recommend that the present committee on Speech Education in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools be discharged. If, on the other hand, the Executive Council believes that the results of the curriculum study of the English Council should be awaited and that this new investigation should be held in abeyance for a year in the hopes of more settled educational and financial conditions, then I recommend that the present Teachers College Committee be continued, particularly to follow up such contacts as have already been made with the Federal Survey of the Training of Teachers.

Whether or not a new committee is authorized, may I venture to suggest as a possibility and a desirability a session at the next National Convention devoted to a consideration of this matter of teacher training, participated in by representatives of various types of institutions and viewpoints.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) Carroll P. Lahman, Chairman"

Immel moved that Lahman's report be accepted. Motion carried. Gough moved that the second alternative mentioned in the report be endorsed and that the present committee be continued for two years. Motion carried.

Bietry, Chairman of Committee of Speech Education in Junior Colleges, sent the following report to the Council:

"The Committee appointed in May, 1930, by President Simon to study the problems of Speech Training in Junior Colleges begs leave to submit the following report:

The committee does not feel that its record this year is one of outstanding achievement, but offers a report in the hope that its accomplishments will be sufficient to justify its existence. The authority to appoint a committee arrived toward the close of a school year and as a result, the group has been slow in getting underway. The personnel of the committee is as follows: Mr. Rolland Shackson, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Junior College; Miss Maude Ramm, Duluth, Minnesota, Junior College; Mrs. Irene C. Hoch, Modesto, California, Junior College; Mr. Glenn Lembke, Pasadena, California, Junior College; Miss Sylvia Barnes, Parsons, Kansas, Junior College; Miss Anne McGurk, Highland Park, Michigan, Junior College; Mr. G. P. Tanquary, Los Angeles, California, University of Southern California; Mr. J. R. Bietry, Los Angeles, California, Junior College, Chairman.

Under the direction of the committee considerable publicity has been given the recent survey of Junior College Speech Training by means of the Quarterly Journal, the Gavel, and the Junior College Journal. Mimeographed copies of the survey were placed in the hands of one hundred Junior College administrators. The Junior College Journal has volunteered to give us unlimited space for discussion of our problems. A whole-hearted cooperation has been extended by members and officers of the American Association of Junior Colleges while a large number of Junior College administrators have expressed an interest in our work through letters to the chairman. A directory of Junior College Speech teachers is being compiled to facilitate the work of the committee and to aid the National Association in its campaign for members.

Projects have been initiated slowly by the committee in order to avoid expense and to evolve a method of procedure before attempting to study a problem without an adequate technique. The committee is especially desirous of avoiding the use of the over-worked questionnaire. Problems upon which the committee is basing its efforts follow.

(a) What should be the content of the fundamental course?
(b) What should be the aim of speech training in the Junior College as defined in terms of the preparatory and terminal functions of the college? (To what extent must Junior College speech courses parallel lower division University courses and to what exent must a sharp differentiation be made?)
(c) What use is made of the entrance test and the speech clinic? How may their value be extended?
(d) What procedure may be employed best to demonstrate the need of compulsory speech training in the Junior College?
(e) What would be the value of suggesting a uniform group of courses with uniform hours of credit?
(f) To what extent do accrediting standards of universities, especially the recognition of Freshman speech subjects, affect the Junior college offering?
(g) Does the emphasis of the 'semi-professional' aim of the Junior College conflict with the ideal of training in Speech as a means of communication? That is, does the Junior College overstress professional proficiency, especially in dramatics?

(h) How shall Junior College dramatics and forensics be controlled and financed?

The Junior College is a pioneering institution; it assumes many forms of organization; it has many types of control; it is motivated by widely differing aims and ideals. Because of these conditions an attack upon Junior College problems must proceed slowly and with carefully planned technique. Therefore the committee recommends that it be continued as a group to study the above problems, and that a Junior College section be recognized again at the 1932 convention at which time responses to the problems be suggested. Because of the close relationship to the secondary school, it is further recommended that at least one member of the Junior College committee be a member of the secondary school committee as at present. Finally, because of the careful guidance, it is recommended that at least one member of the Association who has been a member of the Executive Council be appointed to serve in an advisory capacity along with one or two authorities from the American Association of Junior Colleges.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) J. R. Bietry, Chairman"

Dennis moved that the report and recommendations be accepted and that the committee be continued for two years. Motion carried.

Baird, Chairman, Committee on International Debating, presented his committee report.

Wichelns moved that consideration of the report be deferred until some future time and that Weaver and Baird confer for the purpose of drafting additional recommendations. Motion carried.

Brigance, Chairman, Committee on Oratorical Contests, presented the following resolutions from his committee:

(a) That an advisory educational committee be created composed of teachers of Speech, History, and secondary school administrators, to consider the report of the Committee on Constitutional Contests of the National Association of Teachers of Speech.

(b) That this advisory educational committee using the above report as its basis, or using whatever means that in its judgment seems best, formulate plans to improve the quality of contests below the national and international level, thereby rendering these contests, first, more in harmony with the stated aims, and second, more in harmony with the general ends of education.

(c) That the committee on Oratorical Contests on the Constitution appointed by the National Association of Teachers of Speech, assures the American Committee and the Director General of its willingness to cooperate in the selection of this proposed advisory educational committee.

O'Neill moved that the report be accepted. Motion carried. Weaver moved that the committee be continued for one year. Motion carried.

Judson, Chairman, Committee on Speech Education in Technical Schools, presented the report of his committee.

Pflaum moved that the report be accepted and that the committee be continued with such modification of personnel as the President may deem necessary. Motion carried.

Immel, Chairman, Committee on Voice and Diction Awards, presented the report of his committee.

Dolman moved that the report be accepted and the committee continued. Motion carried.

* * * *

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Sunday, December 27, 1931
8:00 P.M.

Dennis, Chairman, Committee on Constitutional Revision, presented the revised constitution and by-laws and moved its acceptance and presentation to the Association for adoption.

After considerable discussion and several changes, the Council voted to present the following report to the Association with the recommendation that if the revised Constitution and By-laws were adopted as presented, they should become operative at the close of this Convention, but that the officers provided for therein should be elected at this Convention.

CONSTITUTION

Article I

NAME

SEC. 1 The name of this Association shall be THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

OBJECT

SEC. 2 The object of the Association shall be to encourage high standards of study, of scholarship, and of teaching, in the various phases of speech.

Article II

OFFICERS

The officers of this Association shall be:

President
First Vice-President
Second Vice-President
Executive Secretary
Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Speech
Editor of Research Studies
Members of the Executive Council

Article III

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

SEC. 1 The Executive Council shall consist of: the President, the Executive Secretary, the Editor of the Journal, and the Editor of Research Studies for the term of their respective offices and for three years thereafter;

twelve members, elected at large, four each year, for a term of three years; the Vice-Presidents; the President, or his representative, of the Western Association, of the Southern Association, of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, of the American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech, and of such other regional or special associations or federations as may hereafter be officially recognized by the Executive Council.

SEC. 2 Regular meetings of the Executive Council shall be held each year on the evening preceding, and at noon of the last day of, the national convention. Other meetings may be called by the President.

SEC. 3 The Executive Council shall be the ultimate authority in all matters relating to the Association in the periods between conventions, and it shall direct the policies and administer the affairs of the Associaton, except as otherwise provided in the constitution and by-laws; its decisions, however, shall be subject to mandate or revision by a majority vote of any two consecutive annual meetings of the Association.

SEC. 4 The President of the Association shall be president of the Executive Council.

Article IV

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SEC. 1 The President shall prepare the program for the national convention, preside at all business meetings of the Association and of the Executive Council, and represent the Association before other academic organizations. He shall consult with the Executive Secretary in the formulation of any plans involving the expenditure of any considerable sum of money.

SEC. 2 The First Vice-President shall assist the President and perform the duties of the President on occasions of the latter's disability or absence.

SEC. 3 The Second Vice-President shall perform whatever specific duties may be assigned to him by the Executive Council or President.

SEC. 4 The Executive Secretary shall perform all the ordinary duties of Secretary and Treasurer of the Association. He shall also serve as Business Manager of the Journal. He shall be responsible to the Executive Council and shall furnish them with a complete annual financial report. If the Executive Secretary wishes additional authority when the Executive Council is not in session he may proceed with the permission of the President and Editor.

Article V

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 1 Membership in this Association shall be open to any teacher of Speech upon application.

SEC. 2 The Executive Secretary shall grant membership to any other applicants upon written recommendation by any other two members of the Executive Council.

Article VI

Amendments

Sec. 1 Upon recommendation of the Executive Council, this constitution may be amended at any annual meeting, a quorum being present, by a two-thirds vote, absentee votes being counted; upon recommendation of any ten members of the Association, this constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any two consecutive meetings, a quorum being present, and absentee votes being counted; provided in each case, however, that before a vote may be taken upon any proposed amendment, said amendment shall have been published in at least one number of the Quarterly Journal. To secure publication, the proposers of the amendment shall send typewritten copies, properly signed, to the President and to the Editor at least six weeks prior to the first day of the month of desired publication.

Sec. 2 For the purpose of absentee voting upon any proposed amendment to the Constitution, or upon any question which the Executive Council, or any ten members of the Association, wish to present to the membership of the Association for a vote, a ballot containing the amendment or the question at issue shall be enclosed in, or printed in, an issue of the Journal previous to the national convention. To be counted as valid, the ballots must be marked, signed, and returned by mail to the Executive Secretary on or before a day and hour specified by the Executive Council and printed on the ballot.

BY-LAWS

Article I

Election of Officers

Sec. 1 The President, Vice-Presidents, and four of the twelve members of the Executive Council to be chosen at large shall be elected by the Association at each convention. Nominations for this election shall be made by a committee of five chosen in the following manner: Without nominations from the floor the tellers shall distribute blank ballots on which each voter shall place the names of five members of the Association who are eligible to serve on the committee. No ballot containing more or fewer than five names shall be counted. The five members receiving the highest number of votes shall constitute the committee, the one with the largest plurality being chairman. Any ties in the voting shall be broken by the President. No one shall serve on the committee more than once in three years. The nominating committee shall propose one or more names for each office. Before proceeding to a ballot the President shall always call for additional nominations from the floor.

SEC. 2 The Editor of the Journal shall be elected by the Executive Council for a term of three years.

SEC. 3 The Executive Secretary shall be elected by the Executive Council for a term of three years.

SEC. 4 The President and Editor shall be ineligible to succeed themselves.

SEC. 5 When an Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Speech takes office all other positions on the editorial staff should automatically be vacated, leaving the incoming Editor free to organize his staff. The Editor shall consult with the Executive Secretary on all matters involving considerable expenditures.

Article II

DUES

The dues for regular membership in the Association shall be $2.50 a year, payable in advance. This sum covers membership in the Association and subscription to the Journal. The dues for a sustaining membership shall be $10.00 a year, payable in advance. The sustaining membership includes membership in the Association, subscription to the Journal, and, in addition, all other Association publications issued within the period covered by the membership. A fee of $1.00 shall be paid by each person in attendance at the national convention.

Article III

MEETINGS

National conventions shall be held each year at a time and place to be designated by the Executive Council.

Article IV

COMMITTEES

SEC. 1 The Executive Council shall elect a Research Committee the chairman of which shall hold office for three years and act as Editor of Research Studies.

SEC. 2 Other committees may be appointed by the Executive Council, the President, or the Executive Secretary.

Article V

QUORUM

SEC. 1 A quorum at any meeting of the Executive Council shall be eight members.

SEC. 2 A quorum of the Association shall be one-fourth of the members registered at the national convention.

Article VI

AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any meeting of the National Association.

Dolman moved that the 1932 National Convention at Los Angeles be held at the usual time. Motion carried.

GENERAL SESSION OF THE ASSOCIATION

Monday, December 28, 1931
9:30 A.M.

Frank Cody, Superintendent of the Detroit City Schools, was presented to the Association and welcomed the Association to the City of Detroit.

President Simon appointed the following auditing committee:

Ewbank, Chairman, Immel, Gough.

The tellers reported the following result of the ballot for membership on the Nominating Committee:

Rarig, Chairman, Weaver, Dennis, Drummond, Hudson.

President Simon appointed the following Committee on Debating:

Cunningham, Paget, White, Immel, O'Brien.

Dennis, Chairman, Committee on Constitutional Revision, presented the revised constitution, and moved its adoption. Motion carried.

* * * *

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Monday, December 28, 1931
7:55 P.M.

Cortright's report as Chairman of Committee on Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools was taken up for consideration.

Gough moved that the report be accepted. Motion carried. Gough moved that this same committee be reappointed with Cortright as chairman. Weaver moved that the motion be amended to read, "That the Executive Council expresses its very sincere appreciation of Mr. Cortright's services and in the event that he does not see his way clear to accept the reappointment, that the Council respectfully ask that he continue as editor of the May, 1932, Speech Bulletin". Motion carried.

Mabie, Chairman, Committee on Regional Associations, reported the progress of his committee.

Dennis moved that the Council welcome the news of the organization of the Central States Speech Association and look forward with pleasure to the time when this new regional group may be made a part of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. Motion carried.

Baird, Chairman, Committee on International Debating, presented the following recommendations:

> We recommend that the National Student Federation be invited to cooperate with an advisory committee of the National Association of Teachers of Speech for the purpose of, (1) securing satisfactory wording and content of propositions used in the international debates in the United States; (2) utilizing the services of this advisory committee in the selection by the National Student Federation of the American Colleges and Universities that are to send debate teams to England, and of (3) securing reciprocity in financial arrangements in connection with American debates held abroad.

Immel moved that the Committee on Constitutional Revision undertake a study of improving the method of determining the personnel of the Nominating Committee. Motion carried.

Weaver moved that the President appoint Heffner as chairman of a committee for the purpose of studying the question of publishing a bibliography in the various phases of speech education. Motion carried.

Paget moved that the President appoint a committee on Intercollegiate Debating. Motion carried.

* * * *

GENERAL SESSION OF THE ASSOCIATION

Tuesday December 29, 1931

11:00 A.M.

O'Neill, chairman, Committee on Relations with the National Council of Teachers of English, reported the progress of his committee.

Cortright, Chairman, Committee on Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools, reported the progress of his committee.

President Simon appointed the following committee on Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools:

Gladys Borchers—Chairman, University of Wisconsin.
Sara M. Barber—Richmond Hill High School, New York City
J. Richard Bietry—Los Angeles Junior College
Ralph Dennis—Northwestern University
Merle McGinnis—Huntington Park High School, California
Wilhelmina G. Hedde—Sunset High School, Dallas, Texas
Rose Johnson—Woodlawn High School, Birmingham, Ala.
Clara Krefting—Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.
J. Walter Reeves—Peddie Institute, Hightstown, N. J.
Preston H. Scott—Detroit, Chairman of Western Conference

Sarett presented the following resolution:

"At this time, by a change in our constitution, the Executive Council is losing twelve members: James M. O'Neill, James A. Winans, James L. Lardner, Howard S. Woodward, A. M. Drummond, Wilbur Jones Kay, Glenn N. Merry, Edward C. Mabie, Ray K. Immel, Harry B. Gough and John P. Ryan. As an Association, we wish to acknowledge our debt to them for their steadfast service in founding and shaping our organization, a service which has extended over a period of sixteen years. We wish to express our gratitude to these men who have devoted their energies and abilities to the often troublesome tasks that confronted them as presidents, as secretaries and treasurers, as editors of the Quarterly Journal of Speech, and as members of the Executive Council. It is our desire that these retiring councillors, through this resolution, shall know the unanimous friendship and loyalty of our association; and it is our hope that we shall be able to avail ourselves in the future of the experience and leadership of our distinguished fellow members.

I move, therefore, that this be recorded as the sense of this Association and transmitted to each retiring member of the Executive Council.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) Lew Sarett
C. D. Hardy
Hoyt H. Hudson"

Motion carried.

GENERAL SESSION OF THE ASSOCIATION

Wednesday, December 30, 1931
11:30 A.M.

Rarig, Chairman, Nominating Committee, made the following report:

President	Henrietta Prentiss	Hunter College
First Vice-President	Lee Emerson Bassett	Stanford University
Second Vice-President	Virginia Sanderson	San Jose State Teachers College
Members of the Council for one year	Merle McGinnis	Huntington Park (California) H. S.
	F. W. Orr	University of Washington
	E. Z. Rowell	University of California
	Sara Stinchfield	University of California
Members of the Council for two years	W. N. Brigance	Wabash College
	Arthur W. Secord	Paw Paw (Michigan) High School
	C. M. Wise	Louisiana State University
Members of the Council for three years	Maude May Babcock	University of Utah
	J. M. O'Neill	University of Michigan
	W. P. Sandford	University of Illinois
	James A. Winans	Dartmouth College

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) R. B. Dennis
A. M. Drummond
H. H. Hudson
A. T. Weaver
F. M. Rarig

President Simon called for nominations from the floor.
Pflaum nominated Dennis for the three year term.
Paget nominated Monroe for the two year term.

Motion made and carried that the secretary be instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for all nominees other than those nominated for the three and two year terms on the council.

The ballot resulted in the election of the following:
For Two Year Term—Brigance, Secord, Wise.
For Three Year Term—Babcock, Sandford, Winans, Dennis.

The Treasurer's report was made as follows:

Condensed Financial Statement
of
The National Association of Teachers of Speech
Publishers of
THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH
at the close of business December 23, 1931

SCHEDULE I
INCOME

Cash assets brought forward December 30, 1930			$ 780.14
Memberships			
1. Regular	$3,808.99		
2. Sustaining	488.50		4,297.49
Old copies			97.80
Bulletins			233.83
Advertising			893.52
Miscellaneous			
1. Convention registrations (1930)	508.00		
2. Convention dinner receipts (1930)	274.50		
3. Loans	700.00		
4. Other items	69.96	$1,552.46	
Total cash receipts			$7,855.24

EXPENDITURES

Accounts payable brought forward December 30, 1390, and paid			$ 571.34
Printing			
1. February Journal (1931)	$ 803.07		
2. April Journal (1931)	779.29		
3. May Bulletin (1931)	285.21		
4. June Journal (1931)	705.80		
5. November Journal (1931)	723.45		
6. December Bulletin (1931)	204.00		
7. Index to Vol. XVII (1930)	63.00		
8. Convention Program (1931)	124.13		
9. Other items	311.25	3,999.20	
Office Supplies			
1. Postage	395.53		
2. Other items	110.40	505.93	
Secretarial		735.29	
Miscellaneous			
1. Convention dinner (1930)	274.50		
2. Convention costs (1930)	160.31		
3. Moving journals	80.15		
4. Loans and interest	705.15		
5. Other items	293.93	1,514.04	
Total cash expenditures			$7,325.80
Cash on hand December 23, 1931			529.44
TOTAL			$7,855.24

SCHEDULE II
ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

Memberships			
1. Regular	$ 85.00		
2. Sustaining	127.50	$ 212.50	
Advertising		182.00	
Bulletins		2.95	
Old copies		10.50	
Miscellaneous		65.00	
Total		$ 472.95	

SCHEDULE III
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

NONE

SCHEDULE IV

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS FOR THE YEAR

INCOME				
1. Cash (Schedule I)	$7,855.24			
2. Accounts receivable (Schedule II)	472.95	$8,328.19		
EXPENSES				
1. Cash (Schedule I)			$7,325.80	
2. Accounts payable (Schedule III)			00.00	$7,325.80
ASSETS ON DECEMBER 23, 1931				
1. Cash on hand (Schedule I)			529.44	
2. Accounts receivable (Schedule II)			472.95	1,002.39
TOTAL BUSINESS		$8,328.19		$8,328.19

(Signed) G. E. DENSMORE, *Executive Secretary*

Ewbank, Chairman of the Auditing Committee, reported that the audit of the Treasurer's books was satisfactory, and moved that the Treasurer's report be accepted. Motion carried.

Rarig, Chairman, Committee on Resolutions, read the following resolutions which were adopted:

Resolved: That the National Association of Teachers of Speech extends its thanks and appreciation to the following persons:

To Clarence T. Simon for his excellent convention program and for his capable administration of the affairs of the Association during his term of office as president;

To G. E. Densmore for his generous devotion to the arduous duties of his office of executive secretary;

To. A. T. Weaver and the other editors for the high standard of excellence of the Quarterly Journal of Speech under their editorship;

To Rupert Cortright, retiring Chairman of the Committee for the Advancement of Speech Education in Secondary Schools, for his persevering industry in organizing this committee and in directing its activities;

To E. Ray Skinner, Chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, in recognition of the completeness of his planning for the convenience and comfort of the members in attendance at this convention;

To C. L. Menser, Production Manager of the National Broadcasting Company at Chicago, and to the National Broadcasting Company, for their co-operation with this Association in the activities of this convention;

To Frank Cody, Superintendent of Schools of the City of Detroit, for his hospitable welcome to the members of the Association;

To the managers of the Statler Hotel for their many courtesies.

Resolved: That the National Association of Teachers of Speech interprets as its chief function the encouragement of a high standard of study and teaching. It recognizes that its place among learned societies depends upon its ability to foster increasingly high standards of scholarship. It commends the efficient work of its fact-finding committees as aids toward the attainment of these objectives and dedicates itself to the advancement of sound scholarship, of teaching, and of proficiency in the field of Speech, upon which it will continue to depend for its future expansion and reputation.

Resolved: That the incoming President appoint a committee to carry on studies and report to the Association on the methods by which programs of speech education have been introduced into the curricula of public school systems and state courses of study.

Resolved: That the incon.ing President appoint a committee for the advancement of speech education in the elementary schools, and that the chairmen of such regional committees as now exist for this purpose be included in the membership of the national committee.

L. E. Bassett
Edwin H. Paget
A. B. Williamson
F. M. Rarig
Committee on Resolutions.

President Simon explained an arrangement into which he had entered with Dr. Kenyon, President of the American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech, to the effect that since it seemed inadvisable for the American Society to hold its convention in connection with the meeting of the National Association at Los Angeles in 1932, the American Society would hold its next annual convention at a date which would not conflict with the National Association Convention, would do its best to arrange a speech disorders section in connection with the National Association Convention in Los Angeles, and would re-unite with the National Convention the following year (1933). Upon motion of Drummond this arrangement was approved and President-elect Prentiss was authorized to extend a formal invitation to the American Society to resume their joint meetings with the National Association in 1933.

President Simon called Miss Henrietta Prentiss, president-elect, to the chair for official presentation to the Association.

* * * *

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, December 30, 1931
12:30 P.M.

Lahman sent the following recommendation to the Council:

"Dr. Virginia Sanderson, Head of the Department of Speech, at San Jose State Teachers College, San Jose, California, now on leave of absence, is studying at Teachers College, Columbia University, and preparing a suggested speech curriculum for the general elementary school teacher. There is every likelihood that this will be published by Columbia University and will be a definite stimulus to Speech Training for teachers in elementary schools all over the country.

Miss Sanderson feels that her findings will be greatly strengthened if the Executive Council authorizes her to ask interested and qualified members from the Teachers College and Elementary School Committees as well as outside to advise her as a group officially approved by the National Association of Teachers of Speech. This is not to be a permanent standing committee, but a temporary one to function between now and next June.

As chairman of the Teachers College Committee, I hope that this request will be granted.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) Carroll P. Lahman."

Motion made and carried that Lahman's request be granted.

President Simon declared that nominations were in order for editor of the Quarterly Journal of Speech.

Dolman nominated Hudson. In the absence of other nominations, the secretary was instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for Hudson and to declare him elected to the editorship of the Journal for a term of three years, to take office at the 1932 convention.

Brigance moved that it be the consensus of opinion of this council that the special fund derived from each sustaining membership ($7.50) and from the sale of each speech bulletin and research monograph be set aside for the exclusive use of publication other than the Quarterly Journal and that these publications be determined by the committee composed of the President, Editor of the Quarterly Journal, Research Editor, and the Exceutive Secretary. Motion carried.

Weaver moved that if the special fund mentioned in Brigance's motion failed to make available $300 for research publication in 1932, the difference be made up from the general fund. Motion carried.

The Chair appointed Rarig to investigate the ranking of Speech by the North Central Association of Colleges.

(Signed) G. E. Densmore, Executive Secretary

* * * *

FEDERATION OF CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATIONS IS ORGANIZED AT DETROIT

After a year of investigation, the temporary committee organized in 1930 at Chicago called for a meeting of delegates from the State Speech Associations of the Central States at the Detroit Convention for the purpose of forming a Federation.

On Sunday, December 27, these delegates adopted a constitution setting up an executive council which is to select its own chairman and executive secretary. Membership is to be by states rather than by individuals, the latter being automatically included through their membership in state associations.

The states to be included in the Central States Federation are Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota. In most of these, state associations now exist, and in the others they are being formed, through the cooperation of representative committees of speech teachers in those states.

During the year, the activities of the Federation will be carried on through the following committees: (1) *Curricular problems.* This committee, under Professor O. C. Miller of N. W. Missouri State Teachers College, will conduct an investigation of the existing speech curricula in this region. (2) *College Entrance Requirements.* Under Dr. W. P. Sandford of the Univercity of Illinois this committee will study the conditions under which Speech is recognized for college entrance credit. (3) Dr. F. L. D. Holmes of the University of Minnesota will head a committee on *State Associations.* This committee will study the methods by which the existing state associations were formed, it will collect copies of the constitutions of these associations, and will assist in the formation of state organizations where they do not

already exist. (4) *Regional Conference.* This committee, under Dr. Giles Gray of the State University of Iowa, is laying plans for a regional conference to be held in the spring of 1933, probably at Iowa City. This conference will consider problems covering the entire range of speech work, but will concentrate particularly upon secondary school problems.

Election of officers resulted in the selection of Alan H. Monroe of Purdue University as Chairman of the Executive Council, and C. R. Layton of Muskingum College (New Concord, Ohio) as Executive Secretary.

ATTENDANCE AT CONVENTION BY STATES

Alabama 1	New Hampshire 1
California 7	New Jersey 4
Colorado 1	New York 36
Florida 1	North Carolina 1
Idaho 1	North Dakota 1
Illinois 42	Ohio 48
Indiana 17	Oklahoma 1
Iowa 14	Pennsylvania 17
Kansas 3	South Dakota 4
Kentucky 2	Tennessee 1
Louisiana 1	Texas 2
Massachusetts 5	Virginia 1
Michigan 149	Washington 2
Minnesota 20	West Virginia 5
Mississippi 1	Wisconsin 18
Missouri 12	District of Columbia 5
Nebraska 4	Canada 2

Total 430.

NEWS AND NOTES

(Please send all items of general news interest directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 49 East 33rd Street, New York City.)

One of the most interesting recent developments in speech activities in this country was the National Poetry Speaking Festival which was held at the School of Speech of Northwestern University late last April, and which will be held annually in the future. This first Festival was sponsored by prominent American poets as Harriet Monroe, Louise Ayres Garnett, Marion Stroebel, Lew Sarett, and the late Vachel Lindsay. The Advisory Council in charge of the arrangements for the Festival was composed of President Walter Dill Scott of Northwestern University, Davis Edwards of the University of Chicago, Miss Gertrude Johnson of the University of Wisconsin, and Franklin Bliss Snyder of Northwestern University. The Festival was open to men and women eighteen years of age and above, and attracted readers from nine states. Of the seventy-two entrants about forty percent were students in high schools, colleges, and dramatic schools; fifteen percent were teachers or platform readers; and the remainder were individuals who were interested in reading as an avocation only, and who took time off from business and other occupations to attend the Festival. They included housewives, salesmen, librarians, journalists, secretaries, and stenographers.

The primary considerations in judging the merits of the readers were: simplicity, sincerity, a grasp of the poet's concept, and beauty of voice and diction. Judges in the final contest were Davis Edwards, Harold Ehrensperger of the Drama Magazine, Louise Ayres Garnett, Gertrude Johnson, Harriet Monroe, Bertrand G. Nelson of the University of Chicago, Lew Sarett, and Marion Stroebel. The two best speakers in each class in the semi-finals were awarded books, and the three women and the three men winning first places participated in the final contest for the Sidney Lanier Medal for Excellence in Poetry Speaking.

Announcement has recently been made of the Second Annual Festival, which will be held at Northwestern University March 24 and 25, 1932. Entrance blanks must be filed with the "Committee, Poetry Speaking Festival," School of Speech, Northwestern University, before March 10, 1932. Robert Frost and Carl Sandburg have been added to the Advisory Council.

* * * *

The first poetry playhouse in America is to be established at the University of Southern California, according to the announcement of Dean Ray K. Immel, of the School of Speech of that institution. Miss Cloyde Dalzell and Miss Alta B. Hall of the faculty of the School of Speech will be in charge of the playhouse.

Appearing like a miniature theatre with a capacity of fifty people, the playhouse will have a stage and pit that are interchangeable. Programs of poetic pantomine, ballets and other dances with poetic accompaniment, and dramatic adaptation of poems will be presented either on the platform or in the pit. Three bills are scheduled for the spring semester, one of dance portraits, one of a worshipful nature with audience participation, and one of an international character using foreign students who are members of the University Cosmopolitan Club.

* * * *

Part of the same movement which has resulted in the Poetry Festival at Northwestern and the poetry playhouse in Los Angeles, is the formation of the first group to be organized in America for the choric recitation of poetry—the Pasadena Verse Speaking Choir, under the direction of Miss Elizabeth Keppie, head of the dramatic department of Pasadena Junior College.

* * * *

Students of Columbia University, including those of Barnard College, are to have phonograph records of their voices made when they enter as freshmen and when they are graduated as seniors. The records will be added to the collection being made by Professor William Cabell Greet under the auspices of the Council for Research in the Humanities.

* * * *

The tenth anniversary of the founding of the National Association for American Speech was observed by a dinner held at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in New York City, November seventeenth. Dr. John H. Finley, of the editorial staff of the New York Times, presided, and the speakers included Miss Dagmar Perkins, founder and president of the Association, Dr. Walter Damrosch, the Hon. Robert Underwood Johnson, of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, Miss Edith Wynne Matthison, Rabbi Nathan Krass, Miss Agnes Repplier, Mrs. Corinne Roosevelt Robinson, and William Gillette.

* * * *

The men and women who receive degrees in the future from the College of Liberal Arts of Syracuse University must pass a rigid speech test before graduation. University authorities feel that a cultural background is worthless without the ability to speak correctly and fluently.

* * * *

Arrangements have been made by the Speech Department at Purdue University to offer a Speech major, in accordance with the licensing regulations of the State Board of Teaching Licensing. New courses offered this year will include Interpretative Reading and Advanced Debate.

* * * *

The ninth annual convention of the Texas Speech Arts Association was held at Amarillo late in November. The following program was presented:

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 27

Morning—General

"Some Modern Theories of Stuttering"..... Mary K. Sands, Texas College for Women
"Contests" ..... Wanda Banker
"Graduate Work in Speech"..... Earl C. Bryan, College of Industrial Arts

Afternoon—High School Section

"Fundamentals—The Foundation"..... Rebecca Thayer, Gainesville
"Corrective Speech" ..... Ruth Pirtle, Texas Technological College
"Public Speaking" ..... J. N. Watson, Abilene High School
"Teaching Dramatics" ..... Wilhelmina Hedde, Sunset High School, Dallas
"Debate" ..... A. F. Ligon, Ballinger High School
"Declamation" ..... Mrs. Bradshaw, Panhandle High School
"Interscholastic League Play" .. Morton Brown, Interscholastic Bureau, Austin

College Section

"Survey of College Curricula" ..... Earl C. Bryan
"Studio" ..... Dorothy Compere
"Little Theatre" ..... Eloise Sterling-Hirt

General Meeting

"Speech Courses in High Schools". Ella Lunday, State Department of Education
"Contests" ..... Dorothy McClain
"Speech Clinics" ..... Jolen Campbell Parker

* * * *

Illinois teachers of speech held their second annual meeting at Peoria, October 9 and 10. Sessions were held at Bradley Polytechnic Institute. A full program was presented, including sections on debate, dramatics, and oral reading. Some of the interesting resolutions adopted by this body were on the following:

1. Extension of oral composition in schools and colleges advised, on the ground that 75 to 90% of all communication is oral rather than written.
2. Practice of courses in Speech being administered by other than teachers trained in Speech denounced.
3. Belief proclaimed that when departments of Speech are correlated with other departments under so-called Divisions, or when other such administrative plans are put into effect, the Division executives should function merely as executives; and that the direction and administration of courses in Speech should be solely in the hands of teachers trained in Speech.
4. Acceptance of three units in Speech as college entrance credits urged.

* * * *

The fourth annual convention of the Indiana Association of Teachers of Speech was held at the Antlers Hotel in Indianapolis on October 22. Special groups considered problems of dramatics, debate, speech correction, and curricula. Clarence T. Simon, president of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, addressed the convention on "The Field of Speech." The afternoon session was held joinly with the English Section of the State Teachers Association.

The sixth annual convention of the Missouri Valley Debate Association was held at the Kansas City Athletic Club November 20-21. Professor F. H. Rose presided, and an interesting program was offered. Officers for 1932 elected by the Kansas and Missouri State Associations are as follows:

Kansas

President .....R. H. Ritchie, Ottawa University
Vice-President .....J. Thompson Baker, Southwestern College

Missouri

President .....F. H. Rose, State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau
Vice-President .....W. P. Ewing, William Jewell College
Secretary-Treasurer .....H. M. Penick, Kemper Military School

* * * *

The third annual Convention of the Western Association of Teachers of Speech was held in Pasadena, California, November 26-28, 1931, inclusive. More than 350 people attended the Convention. Guest speakers were: Hamlin Garland, Gilmor Brown, Mario Marifioti, Lawrence Grant, and Winifred Richmond. Officers elected for the ensuing year:

President.....Dean Ray K. Immel, University of Southern California
Vice-President.....D. Mack Easton, University of Colorado
Secretary-Treasurer.....Maynard Lee Daggy, State College of Washington

(Up to the time of going to publication, no official minutes had been sent in by the Secretary. They may appear in a later issue of the Journal.)

* * * *

July 25-30, 1932, at Honolulu, Hawaii, will occur the Regional Conference of the World Federation of Education Associations. The conference will relate to all countries in the Pacific and will deal with such subjects as the Dual Language Problem, Modern Educational Problems in the Oriental Setting, Vocational Education, Health Education and Adult Education. For information concerning the program, write to the President, Dr. Paul Monroe, 525 West 120th Street, New York City. For matters pertaining to travel, accommodations and general arrangements, write to the Secretary-General, 1201 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

* * * *

FORENSICS

The first international collegiate radio debate was conducted early in December, when Oxford University debated Harvard University in a transatlantic broadcast debate over the National Broadcasting Company network. The debate was re-broadcast in England by the British Broadcasting Corporation.

* * * *

What is supposed to have been the first intercollegiate contest in after-dinner speaking ever held anywhere took place not long ago in Salem, Oregon, sponsored by the Intercollegiate Forensic Association of Oregon, with Willamette University as the entertaining institution. The general theme for the contest was "American Babbitry." The toastmaster, selected by the entertaining intsitution, prepared the sub-topics, which were drawn by lot by

the visiting contestants three hours before the banquet, each speaker being given a choice of three topics. The public was invited to attend, and forensic directors of the competing schools acted as judges. All speakers wore formal attire. This after-dinner speaking contest is to be a part of the annual program of the Oregon Intercollegiate Forensic Association, replacing the State Constitutional Oratorical Contest.

* * * *

The second annual Debate Conference of the Indiana high schools was held at Purdue University early in December. The following program was presented:

Debate: "Resolved: that the several states should adopt a system of compulsory unemployment insurance." Valparaiso University vs. Butler University.

Judge's critique and decision—H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin.

"The Main Issues in the Debate"—P. Emerson Lull, Purdue University.

"Debate Ethics"—Leland S. Winch, Purdue University.

"Debate Technique and Strategy"—H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin.

"What the Judge Looks for in the Debate"—Alan H. Monroe, Purdue University.

"What the Coach Expects of the Judge"—Darrell Gooch, Lebanon High School.

"An Impelling Plus in Debate"—W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College.

"The Affirmative Case on Unemployment Insurance"—H. D. Morrow, Valparaiso University, C. E. Dammon, Purdue University.

"The Negative Case on Unemployment Insurance"—Claude Sifritt, Butler University, George Beauchamp, Manchester College.

* * * *

The three annual extempore speaking contests of Northwestern University School of Speech were held on November 7. These contests are open to freshmen and men and women undergraduates of the University. The freshman topic was Unemployment Insurance and that for the other two contests was "A Plan for Organizing the Economic Life of the United States." C. C. Cunningham was in charge of arrangements.

* * * *

The debating schedule at Brown University this year calls for debates with Connecticut College, Bates College, Smith College, Dartmouth College, Wesleyan University, Yale University, Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the Durham and Nottingham Universities of England. Fred B. Perkins is in charge of debate activities at Brown.

The debate schedule of North Dakota Agricultural College for this year calls for international debates with the University of Manitoba and Robert College of Constantinople, and intercollegiate debates with the University of North Dakota, the University of South Dakota, South Dakota State College, Montana State College, and Concordia College of Minnesota, in addition to about fifty community debates in all parts of North Dakota and several cities in Minnesota.

As noted above, the foreign teams debating in the United States this year are a Turkish team from Robert College, an Oxford team, and a second English team composed of one speaker from University College, Nottingham, and one from St. John's College, Durham University. The propositions being debated by these teams are listed here.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS

1. That the Statue of Liberty is not a signpost but a gravestone.
2. That immediate independence should be granted to India.
3. That the press is Democracy's greatest danger.
4. That the nations of the world should take a twenty-year tariff holiday.
5. That American civilization is a greater danger to the world than that of Russia.

ENGLISH UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS

1. That the dole provides a better method of solving the unemployment problem than does the charity system.
2. That the world has more to fear from Fascism than from Bolshevism.
3. That the formation of a federation of European states would be conducive to world peace and prosperity.
4. That the future well-being of humanity depends on the continued dominance of the white races.
5. That this house favors international agreements for free trade among the nations.

ROBERT COLLEGE QUESTIONS

1. That Turkey should be a member of the League of Nations.
2. That the mandatory system used by the Great Powers is a continuation of imperialistic policies.
3. That the world has more to fear from Fascism than from Bolshevism.
4. That the United States should recognize the government of U.S.S.R.
5. That compulsory unemployment insurance should be adopted by the sovereign states as public protection against the vicissitudes of the Machine Age.

* * * *

Among the most popular questions being debated in the United States this year are those concerning the formation of a third political party, unemployment insurance, the cancellation of World War debts, the abolition of the capitalistic system, the adoption of some such plan as the Stuart Chase plan for the stabilization of business, government control of industry, imposition of a sales tax, fixing farm prices, disarmament, the adoption of communism, the Hoover administration, and the entrance of women into industrial and political life. Most high school leagues are using the unemployment insurance proposition.

* * * *

DRAMATICS

Under the direction of Lester Raines, of the New Mexico Normal University, the Dramatic Arts Round Table of the University of Minnesota dur-

ing the past summer presented three major productions: *Marco Millions*, by Eugene O'Neill, *The Vagabond King*, a musical play by J. H. McCarthy and Rudolph Friml, and Rostand's *L'Aiglon*.

* * * *

Summer productions of the University of Michigan Repertory Players, who are all advanced students in the play production courses, were as follows: *Paris Bound*, by Philip Barry; *Don Juan*, Moliere; *Liliom*, Ferenc Molnar; *Love and Chance*, Marivaux; *Alison's House*, Susan Glaspell; *Beggar on Horseback*, Kaufman and Connelly; and *Camille in Roaring Camp*, T. W. Stevens. Each play ran four nights. Members of the production staff were Valentine B. Windt, of the Michigan faculty, Thomas Wood Stevens, and M. Jean Mercier.

* * * *

Koshares, the producing group at the New Mexico Normal University, presented seven original plays written by students in the University during the second term of the summer session.

* * * *

The Arizona State Teachers College at Tempe, under the direction of Miss Beryl Simpson, is producing a one-act play each week, which serves as the vehicle for those interested in acting and play production. An hour's credit is offered to any student who puts in 54 hours of work during the semester on the stage or in the workshop. More than twelve percent of the entire student body is registered for this work, and three plays are usually in rehearsal at the same time, each with a different cast and a different production staff. Students are given opportunities to work at acting, staging, designing, make-up, or any phase of production in which they are interested.

* * * *

De Pauw University has just established, through the Department of Speech, a Drama Loan Library. A bulletin containing a list of about twelve hundred plays available in the library has been printed and sent to schools and churches throughout the state. Copies of plays are sent without charge for reading purposes, the borrower paying only postage charges both ways. Correspondence regarding the Drama Loan Library should be addressed to the Department of Speech at De Pauw University, Greencastle, Indiana.

* * * *

The first production at the Northwestern University Theatre this year was *Remote Control*, a mystery play by Fuller, North, and Nelson. John F. Baird directed the performance. *Paola and Francesca* was produced later, under the direction of George Phelps, and Gogol's *Inspector General* followed. The annual student revue, *Scrapbook*, was presented early in December. The Children's Theatre of Evanston opened its season with Barrie's *Peter Pan*, directed by Miss Winifred Ward of the School of Speech staff. Three other plays will be presented during the year, one of them an Indian drama written by Mrs. Charlotte Chorpenning, who was formerly a member of the School of Speech staff, but now teaches sociology in the University.

Recent productions of the Dakota Playmakers, at the University of North Dakota, have included *The Pillars of Society,* for which the acting version was prepared by the director, E. D. Schonberger, and Capek's *R. U. R.* The next play to be produced will be Phillip Barry's *Holiday,* to be followed by Ibsen's *Wild Duck.*

* * * *

Ibsen's *Pillars of Society* was also chosen as the Senior Class Play at Santa Monica High School in California, and was presented in November, under the direction of Miss Olive Morris.

* * * *

Fall productions at Alabama College, Montevallo, included *When the Dead Live On,* by Walter Trumbauer, and Moliere's *Imaginary Invalid.* Walter Trumbauer directed both productions. The College Theatre at Alabama College is offering two prizes in playwriting—for the best one-act and for the best long play.

* * * *

Recent productions at the Leland Powers School in Boston comprised *The Black Flamingo,* by Sam Janney, which was staged by Emily Perry Nietsche, and *Nine Till Six,* by Aimee and Philip Stuart, directed by Moroni Olsen.

* * * *

Under the direction of Richard Woellhaf, the Masquers at Denison University are planning productions of *Berkeley Square, Beggar on Horseback, Hedda Gabler, The Royal Family,* and an original play for the current season.

* * * *

A program of one-act plays was presented recently at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. They included O'Neill's *In the Zone, The Beggar and the King,* by Winthrop Parkhurst, and *The Idlings of the King,* by Erle Remington.

* * * *

The Wisconsin University Theatre presented the following program during the first semester of 1931-32: *If I Were King,* October 13-17, *The Adding Machine,* November 17-21, and *Androcles and the Lion,* December 8-12. In addition to these amateur productions the theatre has offered to the public: Maurice Browne's production of *The Unknown Warrior* and the Abbey Players in *The Far-Off Hills, the Rising of the Moon,* and *The Playboy of the Western World.*

* * * *

Richard B. Harrison, who plays "the Lord" in *The Green Pastures,* gave a program of Shakespearean readings at the Northwestern University School of Speech in November.

* * * *

PERSONALS

Members of the National Association of Teachers of Speech will be glad to learn that Lew Sarett's latest volume of poems, *Wings Against the Moon,* published this fall by Henry Holt and Company, is enjoying a really extra-

ordinary success, and is receiving favorable comment in literary journals and the press throughout the country. This is his fourth volume of poems. Mr. Sarett is a member of the faculty of the School of Speech at Northwestern University.

Dr. Clarence T. Simon, director of the Northwestern University speech clinic, and president of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, gave an address at a joint meeting of the speech training and speech correction divisions of the Wisconsin State Teachers Association in Milwaukee in November. C. C. Cunningham, also of Northwestern University, read a paper before the debate section of the same convention.

Hugh Massey Tilroe has retired from teaching. He organized the School of Speech of Syracuse University, where he has taught since 1909.

Waldo E. Waltz, who has been instructor in political science at the University of Illinois for the past two years, has joined the Public Speaking staff as an Associate, in charge of debate work. A. D. Huston assists him. They succeed Leon McCarty, who, however, remains in the Department, and Miss Mary E. Whiteford, who resigned because of her marriage to Professor W. J. Graham, head of the English Department.

Bower Aly has relinquished the direction of forensic activities at the University of Missouri, in order to devote his time to teaching and graduate work. Wilbur E. Gilman has been placed in charge of forensic activities, assisted by Gerald Shively, who recently received his master's degree from the Northwestern University School of Speech. The Missouri debating season this year opened with a debate with Oxford University on the question of Russian civilization versus that of America.

John Casteel, formerly head of the Speech Department at Nebraska Wesleyan University, is now head of the speech division of the English Department at the University of Oregon. Horton Talley, who received his master's degree from Northwestern University last year, succeeds him at Nebraska Wesleyan.

William R. Duffey, founder and director of the School of Speech at Marquette University for about ten years, has returned to Marquette from St. Thomas College at St. Paul, where he has been Business Manager for the last two years. He will open a Speech Correction Clinic at Marquette.

H. L. Ewbank, of the University of Wisconsin, is the new president of Delta Sigma Rho, national forensic honor society.

Garrett Leverton, director of the Northwestern University Theatre, is enjoying a year's leave of absence to do graduate work at Columbia University. John F. Baird, formerly director of the Northwestern Repertory Theatre, is taking his place.

Miss Margaret Letzter is a graduate student at the University of Iowa this year. For the past two years she has been a member of the clinic staff at Northwestern University. Miss Verna Finger and Miss Helen Baldwin have been added to the clinic staff at Evanston this year.

Hardy Ray, who has been announcing at radio station WPTF in Raleigh, North Carolina, and at WOAI, San Antonio, Texas, is teaching and studying at the Northwestern University School of Speech this year.